

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA

main,stks

205Ev13

Lutheran quarterly.

v.46 1916 Lutheran quarterly



0 0001 00658548 1


REFERENCE



COLLECTIONS



04-79-872-4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLVI

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1916

U. S. *Federal trade commission.*

... Report on trade and tariffs in Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Peru. June 30, 1916. Washington, Govt. print. off., 1916.

246 p. incl. tables, forms. 25^{cm}.

At head of title: Federal trade commission.

1. U. S.—Comm.—Spanish America. 2. Spanish America—Comm.—U. S. 3. Tariff—Spanish America. I. Title.

Library of Congress

— — — — Copy 2.

HF3080.A4 1916

[s19h3]

16—26739

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLVI

- ✓ Alleman, Prof. Herbert C., Article by, 517.
- ✓ Architecture, Lutheran Church, 412.
- ✓ Atkins, Gaius Glenn, Article by, 430.
- ✓ Atonement, The Lutheran View of the, 237.
- ✓ Authority in Religion, The Seat of, 101.
- ✓ Bauslin, Prof. D. H., Article by, 34, 41.
- ✓ Bell, Dr. Ezra K., Article by, 1
- ✓ Bergson's Philosophy, Elements of, 348.
- ✓ Carnegie Pension Plan for College Teachers, Radical Change in, 512.
- ✓ Clutz, Dr. J. A., Article by, 157.
- ✓ Christology, A Brief Study of, 399.
- ✓ Church Architecture, Lutheran, 412.
- ✓ Church History Pure and Applied, 469.
- ✓ Church History Through Church Statistics, 365.
- ✓ Church, The, 319.
- ✓ Dedication of Hamma Divinity Hall, 41.
- ✓ Dempwolf, Frederick G., Article by, 412.
- ✓ Education, The Scope of Religious, 565.
- ✓ Faith and Changing Conditions, The Changeless, 10.
- ✓ Faith, Full Assurance of, 63.
- ✓ Faith and Works, The Relation of, 532.
- ✓ Faulkner, Prof. Alfred, Article by, 184.
- ✓ Fox, Prof. Luther A., Article by, 348.
- ✓ Getty, Rev. G. Albert, Article by, 532.
- ✓ Gotwald, Dr. Frederick G., Article by, 82.
- ✓ Granville, President Wm. A., Article by, 512.
- ✓ Hamma Divinity Hall, Dedication of, 41.
- ✓ Hamma, The Rev. Michael Wolfe, D.D., LL.D., 34.
- ✓ Hantz, Prof. J. M., Article by, 196.
- ✓ Heathcote, Rev. Charles William, Article by, 565.
- ✓ History Through Church Statistics, Church, 365.
- ✓ International Relationships, The Spirit of Jesus in, 430.
- ✓ Jacobs, Prof. Henry E., Article by, 10.
- ✓ Jacoby, Dr. J. C., Article by, 399.
- ✓ Jesus, The Spirit of, in International Relationships, 430.
- ✓ Keyser, Prof. Leander S., Article by, 237, 548.
- ✓ Landmarks, The Old, 1.
- ✓ Leo XIII, The Social Program of, 542.
- ✓ Literary Approximations, Some, 500.
- ✓ Literature, Review of Recent, 135, 298, 455, 593.
- ✓ Luther, Melanchthon's Doctrinal Differences from, 184.
- ✓ Lutheran Church Architecture, 412.
- ✓ Lutheran Church Prior to the Founding of Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845, Theological Education in the, 82.

- ✓ Lutheran Church, Rhinebeck, N. Y., Historical Sketch of St. Paul's, 382.
- ✓ Lutheran View of the Atonement, The, 237.
- ✓ Lutheranism and Nationality, 285.
- ✓ Man's Pre-eminence Among Creatures, 196.
- ✓ Melancthon's Doctrinal Differences from Luther, 184.
- ✓ Millennial Dawn, or Russellism, 212.
- ✓ Old Testament Religion, The, 548.
- ✓ Old Testament in the Light of To-day, The, 517.
- ✓ Pannkoke, Rev. O. H., Article by, 542.
- ✓ Pennypacker, Isaac R., Article by, 500.
- ✓ Prince, Prof. B. F., Article by, 73.
- ✓ Religion, The Old Testament, 548.
- ✓ Religion, The Seat of Authority in, 101.
- ✓ Religious Education, The Scope of, 565.
- ✓ Review of Recent Literature, 135, 298, 455, 593.
- ✓ Rhinebeck, N. Y., Historical Sketch of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, 382.
- ✓ Russellism, Millennial Dawn, or, 212.
- ✓ Singmaster, Prof. J. A., Article by, 101. Current Theological Thought, in English, 118, 275, 441, 577.
- ✓ Statistics, Church History Through Church, 365.
- ✓ St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Rhinebeck, N. Y., Historical Sketch of, 382.
- ✓ Stup, Rev. Grayson Z., Article by, 212.
- ✓ Testament in the Light of To-day, The Old, 517.
- ✓ Testament Religion, The Old, 548.
- ✓ Theological Education in the Lutheran Church Prior to the Founding of Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845, 82.
- ✓ Theological Education in Wittenberg College, 73.
- ✓ Theological Thought, Current, 118, 275, 441, 577.
- ✓ Traver, Dr. Chester H., Article by, 382.
- ✓ Tressler, Prof. V. G. A., Article by, 365.
- ✓ Voigt, Prof. Andrew G., Article by, 63.
- ✓ Weigle, Dr. E. D., Article by, 319, 493.
- ✓ Wentz, Charge to Dr. Abdel Ross, 493.
- ✓ Wentz, Prof. Abdel Ross, Article by, 469. Current Theological Thought, in German, 127, 285, 448, 586.
- ✓ Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845, Theological Education in the Lutheran Church Prior to the Founding of, 82.
- ✓ Wittenberg College, Theological Education in, 73.
- ✓ Works, The Relation of Faith and, 532.

BOOKS REVIEWED

JANUARY.

John Wesley's Place in History—The Universe as Pictured in Milton's Paradise Lost—Studies in Recent Adventism—The Redemption of the South End—Sermons on the Eisenach Gospels—Sermons on the Catechism Vol. I, the Ten Commandments—The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper—The Reformation and Its Effects—The Life and Works of Rev. Charles S. Albert, D.D.—Paul and His Epistles—Religious Education and the Healing of the Church—Trends of Thought and Christian Truth—Pneumatology or the Doctrine of the Work of the Holy Spirit—My Church—The Five-fold Pathway—The Efficient Congregation—The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book—The Methodist Year Book.

APRIL.

Old Testament History—Jerusalem to Rome—The Truth of the Apostles' Creed—Catechism Bible Narratives—The Influence of Lutheranism Outside of the Lutheran Church—The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia—Miscellaneous Inscriptions—The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites—Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy—The Literary Primacy of the Bible—Conversations with Luther—The Ethiopic Library—Subject and Object—The New Personality and Other Sermons—Luther in Light of Recent Research—Scandinavian Immigrants in New York—God's Word and God's Work—The Six Days of Creation in the Light of Modern Science—Saved to Serve—Inner Mission Work—The Doctrinal Teachings of Christian Science.

JULY.

Dictionary of the Apostolic Church—The Difference—Weg des Lebens—The Centennial History of the American Bible Society—Psychological Studies in Lutheranism—A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America—The Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect—The Lutheran Manual—The Churches of the Federal Council.

OCTOBER.

Works of Martin Luther—Sunday, The World's Rest Day—Basic Ideas in Religion or Apologetic Theism—Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics—The Mythology of all Races, Greek and Roman, North America—Religious Rheumatism—The Eisenach Gospel Selections—Some Counterfeit Religions—Historical Lutheranism—A Fourfold Test of Mormonism—Christ's Humiliation.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY 1916.

ARTICLE I.

THE OLD LANDMARKS.¹

BY REV. EZRA K. BELL, D.D.

Proverbs xxiii:10—"Remove not the old landmarks."

There are some old things which must pass away. Some things are always left behind in the march of progress. They were at one time a necessity; nobody needs them now.

But there are some old things which will be needed as long as the world stands. Among these are what the ancients called landmarks. Every man's field had its boundary. It was customary to mark the boundaries of estates by corner stones. To remove these landmarks was a crime against the State. Kings lost their crowns and sometimes their lives for depriving the people of their patrimony in land.

We have a spiritual inheritance handed down by the fathers: our patrimony in truth and virtue. This is of more value than boundless acres. It behooves us to look well to its preservation.

In our day attempts are constantly being made to remove the landmarks of this estate. It is one of the dangerous tendencies of modern thought. Popular litera-

¹ The sermon preparatory to the dedication of the new Hamma Divinity Hall, Wittenberg College, by Rev. Ezra K. Bell, D.D.

ture is full of it. It is specious, professedly new and is calculated to do much harm, not to the truth, but to multitudes of people, by unsettling their faith.

The first landmark that we must guard is the Bible. At a time when the inerrancy of the old book is being assailed from within, as well as without the Church, we do well to emphasize some of the reasons why we can not abandon it.

Manifestly we must have some authority in spiritual truth; there must be something to which we must appeal for certainty or else we are forever tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.

There are three sources of authority in religion. One of these is (a) the individual consciousness. Those who hold to this say that every man must determine by his own reason what is truth. But there are many men and many minds and what certainty could there be if it were based on human opinion. From that standpoint the opinion of an atheist would be of as much value as that of the Apostle Paul. There must therefore be the landmarks of a better way. (b) The second source of authority is the Church. This is higher ground but it is open to the same objections. History shows that the Church has again and again committed grievous errors through her Councils and therefore cannot be the ultimate authority in religion. (c) The third and remaining source of authority is the Scriptures which the reformers and those who follow them claim to be an infallible rule of faith and practice having been written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Here we have an authoritative voice. Here we have the very word of God. Infinite goodness and infinite wisdom have given us a book which shows us the way, the truth, and the life. It affords us just what we need. It is an infallible guide and gives us the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

A second landmark that must not be removed is the deity of Jesus Christ. He claimed to be very God of very God. The Scriptures declare Him to be the Christ of

God. We dare not surrender the deity of Jesus Christ. Men may extol his virtues, say beautiful things about his life, and magnify his wise sayings, but we want the truth and must have it, that He was the eternal God manifest in the flesh.

A third landmark we must not have removed is justification by faith. In common with all believers we hold that Christ assumed the shame, bondage, and penalty of our sins and bore them in his own body on the tree. He took our place before the law being wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities that by his stripes we might be healed. He hath delivered us up from the power of darkness and translated us into His kingdom: in whom we have redemption through His blood even the forgiveness of our sins. St. Paul says the just shall live by faith and that being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. The doctrine of justification by faith is fundamental. Luther called it "the article of a standing or falling church." It is an old landmark which dare not be removed.

A fourth landmark is the power and personality of the Holy Spirit. We are living in the dispensation of the Spirit. Before our Lord's departure, he breathed on His disciples saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," at the same time sending them forth under His great commission: "Go ye unto all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Moreover the Holy Spirit is always calling, enlightening, and sanctifying the Children of God. He takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us. We are baptized not only into the name of the Father and of the Son, but into the name of the Holy Ghost.

And now these are the landmarks that stand at the four corners of the King's domain: An inspired book, a divine Savior, a faith that justifies and a Spirit that illumines and sanctifies. The eternal God provided these landmarks for us. Having created us, He knew precisely what our needs would be. He knew that we would

need a book that would answer every question of the heart. He knew we would need a Saviour who could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, mighty to save. He knew that a justifying faith would unite us to God and that the Holy Spirit would afford the light we need to read our title to the heavenly home.

In these landmarks we have all that the soul needs. No further revelation is required. Neither reason nor the Church can add anything of profit to that which has been given us. In our inheritance, in that which has been handed down to us, we may have safety and peace.

We do well to abide in the faith of our fathers who laid the foundations upon which we are now building here and laid them deep and strong on that which was already laid in Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church. We are the inheritors of an evangelical faith that rests on the verities of the word of God.

The times in which we live are changeful and there is an increasing drift away from our cherished faith to a modernized Gospel in which the supernatural is diminished and the human magnified. The old is less and less esteemed and the quest for something new goes on. The Church, when influenced by this process, is restless, going on her way with faltering step while doubt and fear take the place of quiet faith and confident assurance.

Theological schools of the denominations have, in many instances, been more or less affected by methods which undertake the shifting of the old landmarks which have been the source of a pure scriptural faith and a triumphant hope. These schools have exercised a marked influence upon popular religious thought and have led, in many instances, to the entire abandonment of the Scriptures as an infallible guide and to the enthronement of the individual consciousness as the final test of truth.

It is a matter for devout thanksgiving that our Lutheran schools in this country have thus far refused to yield to the subtle influence of those modern teachers who have, in so large part, departed from the old paths of revealed truth. Our Lutheran steadfastness, our Lutheran

adherence and unswerving loyalty to the fundamental principles of the evangelical faith, is the marvel of those who understand conditions in the Fatherlands where there has not been the steadfast unanimity in holding to the principles of the Reformation and of an evangelical Protestantism. It has been said by one of the greatest scholars in the denominations that the hope of evangelical Christianity in this country rests largely in the Lutheran Church because of her persistence in maintaining the true evangelical standards and her refusal to swerve from the cardinal principles of the Christian faith.

This institution has always stood four square for a pure unadulterated and steadfast evangelical faith. Its founder, the Rev. Dr. Ezra Keller, was a man of remarkable insight into the fundamental truths of holy Scripture. Both he and his successor, Dr. Samuel Sprecher, who laid the foundations and directed the building of the super-structure, were not only men of distinguished piety but of singular fidelity to the essential doctrines of our holy faith. So too Dr. Ort. I recall Dr. Sprecher's saying to some of us on one occasion that in all his close relationship with Dr. Ort he had never known him to swerve in the slightest particular from the evangelical faith as witnessed in the Lutheran Church. Dr. Keller sought out Dr. Sprecher to succeed him and Dr. Sprecher selected Dr. Ort.

What a trio of really great teachers they were! The piety, self-sacrificing zeal, and devotion of Dr. Keller were exceptional. The philosophical and intuitive perception of truth which Dr. Sprecher had, led the celebrated Joseph Cook, who visited him, to say that he had not met his equal anywhere in America. The fine theological acumen of Dr. Ort, his ability to analyze and state truth with definiteness and perspicuity, and that too in faultless diction, made him one of the foremost religious teachers of his day.

These great teachers who described the boundaries and laid the foundations of this school were men who were not only evangelical in their teaching but they had a great

love for the Lutheran Church and kindled a deep love for her in the hearts of their students. For the times in which they lived, for the environment in which they wrought, they are illustrious in their steadfastness to the essentials of the Christian faith. They may not indeed have had particular zeal for the outward form but they had a great passion for the real and vital in Christian life and service.

It is indeed true that in the days when the General Synod was finding her place in this country, when rationalistic influences on the one hand and Puritan influences on the other were so pronounced, that distinctive Lutheranism failed in certain instances of proper appreciation. Then some of the ablest and most devout leaders of our Church felt with Dr. Sprecher that an American Lutheran Church could best conserve her interests by a modified Confessional position. But the experiment was disappointing and was shortly abandoned, and in his later years Dr. Sprecher came to a confessional position for himself, which he declared to be a full acceptance of all the symbols of the Lutheran Church.

It was my good fortune to be a student under both Drs. Sprecher and Ort and I recall no instance when any effort whatever was made to modify our Lutheran conception of the means of grace or the acceptance of the Augustana. In the earlier days when there was a lack of Lutheran consciousness in the General Synod it may have been different. But there never was in any period the slightest trace of the rationalistic tendencies which were so pronounced in the early part of the last century in the strong and influential Eastern Ministeriums. The fathers here always held the Scriptures to be supreme as the veritable word of God. There never was the slightest modification of the principles of the Evangelical faith. The writer recalls with delight the influence of the great teachers here, an influence that served to create a lasting love and devotion to the distinctive truth set forth in our Confession. So it was with others, with Gotwald the great pastor teacher who anticipated in his life and work

the best in Gerberding's "Pastor," whose every power was consecrated to his beloved Lutheran Church; of Breckenridge, the master of every subject that he approached, the scholar among scholars, the stalwart and impassioned advocate of the distinctive principles of Lutheranism.

This conservative school, recognized as one of the most distinctively Lutheran schools in our Church, is not more loyal to the essential verities of our precious faith than were these fathers; especially when we consider the times, the environment, and general conditions under which they wrought and taught. Modern liberalism can find no encouragement in either precept or example on the part of those who described the landmarks of this theological school. Let us thank God for that which has been wrought here for our blessed Lord and His kingdom and for our Lutheran Church in all that makes her distinctive in her evangelical testimony and her particular apprehension of the Gospel.

The fathers may not have given sufficient attention to form so as to make a Church distinctive and outstanding in its testimony. They may have been affected in the outward by the overshadowing influences of Calvinism, Puritanism, and Revivalism; but notwithstanding these modifying influences they laid deep and strong the foundations for a distinctively evangelical school upon which those could build who came after them in the day when the larger perception of things related to Lutheran doctrine and practice would be increasingly manifest.

Let us thank God to-day as we present to Him this splendid building, for a school of theology, that the landmarks of the past so clearly outlined the essentials of a holy evangelical faith, and let us thank Him also that those who are now in the teacher's place are with such signal unanimity in accord with the principles and practices of our beloved Church.

This is a glad day because there is so much here to inspire us with hope. It is a day in which to be thankful to Almighty God for putting it into the heart of a gradu-

ate of this seminary, the Rev. Dr. M. W. Hamma of blessed memory, to provide for the larger needs that have come to us. And above all, let us give thanks and praise to His holy name that we are kept in the faith of our fathers and with reverent affection cherish the older landmarks of our Church—the Church of the pure Gospel in which the means of grace are still the word and sacraments—our dear old Church, our fathers' and our own.

In outlining the landmarks that distinguish the evangelical faith, mention was made of the infallible truth in Holy Scripture, the deity of Jesus Christ, justification by faith and the work of the Holy Spirit. Shall we not realize to-day as we come to the Lord's table that the Holy Supper of which we partake has to do with all that is fundamental in revealed truth? For is not all truth connected with salvation focalized in the sacrament? The Lord's Supper is not something in its content that is separate and distinct from any great truth of the Gospel. It is all of the Gospel focalized and condensed in that particular declaration "given and shed for you for the remission of sins." All lines of revelation and grace converge in this blessed sacrament. As all roads led to Rome, so does all truth unfold itself here. The holy sacrament is related to our baptism and our regeneration, to our sanctification and cleansing, to the forgiveness of sin, in fact to all of our spiritual needs in this life and to our glorification in the life to come. It is of the glorified Christ that we partake, "the body and the blood," and who shall say as we partake of the glorified One that our eating and drinking is not related to the resurrection body in which we are to be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. It has not entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.

So our Lutheran faith sees in the sacrament that which others may not perceive, but which our devout reverence for the word of God hath led us to see. Dr. Sprecher used to say to his class that a Lutheran communicant could hardly go into a Church of the denominations on a

sacramental occasion and not feel that his own Church connected something peculiarly precious with the sacrament which others did not teach nor see.

Luthardt says: "The Lord's Supper is the holy of holies of the Christian Church which our thoughts cannot approach without awe. Whether or not our minds are capable of fully rising to it, the chief matter is to receive with a believing and humble mind what is here given us and obtain the blessing which is here opened."

"Here at Thy table, Lord we meet
To feed on food divine;
Thy body is the bread we eat,
Thy precious blood the wine."

ARTICLE II.

THE CHANGELESS FAITH AND CHANGING CONDITIONS.¹

BY PROFESSOR HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D., S. T. D.

Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy,
Philadelphia, Pa.

No truer words were ever uttered by uninspired man than those, with which, on the tercentenary of the Reformation, nearly one hundred years ago, the Lutheran pastor, Claus Harms, opened his most effective XCV Theses against the Rationalism that had long been desolating the Church and institutions of Germany. They are:

“When our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ said, ‘Repent,’ He meant not that His doctrine should be conformed to men, but that men should be conformed to His doctrine.”

Christianity is not a chameleon that changes color with its temper, or according to its surroundings. If it were not constant and invariable, it would have no permanence, and its lack of sincerity would long since have been exposed.

But it stands firm after centuries of incessant attack, in which the gates of Hell, have done their utmost for its overthrow, and in which it has been subjected to every test that man’s art can devise, and has steadily advanced amidst all its trials, because it worships but One Lord, partakes of but one baptism, and is sustained by one and the same unvarying faith in a Saviour, who is the same yesterday and to-day and forever. The truth of one age, is a truth for all ages. What is false in one, is false in all.

Even Omnipotence does not destroy facts. What is

¹ An address delivered Nov. 11, 1915, at the dedication of the buildings of the Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

once a fact, is a fact for all eternity. A real principle in any science, whether Philosophy, Physics or Theology, is immutable, however diverse may have been the hypotheses that preceded its recognition. The law exists apart from man's apprehension of it. Real theories succeed hypotheses, when the human mind at last grasps the principles which God has determined from the beginning. The law of gravitation was in force in prehistoric times, when the Egyptians built the pyramids, many centuries before it was discovered by a great English thinker. The sun which shines upon us to-day, is the same sun that gave light and heat to our remote ancestors on the highlands of Asia, before they began their migrations to Europe. Nor has moral truth varied the least shadow of a shade since the Ten Commandments were given on Sinai. Even then, it was nothing new, but had existed forever in God.

And yet, since God, the Source of all truth is infinite, and man, with whom God deals is finite, the truth, as revealed to man, has its limitations and degrees. Every revelation of the Infinite to the finite, is necessarily partial and incomplete. But this partial and incomplete knowledge is none the less certain and permanent. Every truth communicated remains truth forever; but only time unfolds its significance. Through the processes of spiritual life, God leads man to an ever deeper understanding of the simplest truths, and to an ever increasing realization of what that truth is in the various relations which it bears to other truths.

Christianity, with its clearer knowledge, does not reject the Old Testament, as no longer true, but claims to be the fulfilment of all that was written in the Law and the Prophets. The New, lay hidden in the Old Testament, like the oak within the acorn; the Old is unfolded in the New Testament, like the seed sown in the autumn, is unfolded in the harvest of the next summer.

The Gospel for the First, is also the Gospel for the Twentieth Century. Nothing has been added to it; nothing withdrawn from it. The Gospel for the Old, is also the Gospel for the New World. The Gospel for the most

uncultured races is that also for the profoundest scholars. The Bible, as it was transmitted by painstaking copyists a millenium and a half ago, is the same Bible that we treasure to-day. The intervention of centuries has not diminished the force or depreciated the value of any of the words of Jesus. No sociological investigations have discovered any new remedy for sin, or reduced its significance as the real cause of all the misery and disorders of humanity.

But in the application of religious truth, there is real progress. This is taught us in Scripture under various figures, and especially in the Parable of the Mustard Seed. No individual can grasp with his intellect or apply to practice more than a very small portion of what is provided for the varying wants of the entire race under the different conditions in which its members are placed through the ages as they succeed one another. No single generation can formulate such a summary of the entire contents of Revelation, as leaves nothing more to be said or learned in years to come. The truth is the same, but finality is never reached in its apprehension.

Even among the first followers of our Lord there was a difference of capacity for the reception of truth which He taught. The Jesus of John and the Jesus of the Synoptics is the very same; but they present the same personality from different angles. A mountain offers a great variety of features, as we pass around it, or change our elevation. The conception of Christianity, as given by Peter and those closest to him, is not antagonistic to that of Paul and his disciples; and, yet, each has its distinctive marks. As the truth apprehended by Peter in no way contradicted what had been previously taught by Isaiah, but only presented with distinctness what the prophet had dimly foreshadowed, so the teaching of Paul is only from a higher standpoint and with a wider horizon, that illustrates and illumines what the older apostle suggested.

Once while reflecting on this distinction, my eyes fell on a favorite photograph on the wall of my study, sent me by a thoughtful friend in India. It is a view of the

Himalayas from Darjeeling on the Tibet frontier. Nearest you, rise foot-hills of no mean elevation. Parallel with them, runs a second chain, in whose presence, the foot-hills dwindle into insignificance. But far beyond, towers a long-ridged, snow-draped eminence, Mt. Kanchanjanga, "the Lord of the great snows," losing the contest with Mt. Everest as the highest mountain in the world, by only a few hundred feet. Mt. Blanc might be piled on Mt. Blanc, and, for only one-fifth of its height, would it overtop that dazzling crest.

Those foot-hills stand for the Old Testament prophets; the range beyond, for Peter and his associates on the Mount of Transfiguration. But Paul stands on the peak, that pierces the heavens, where he heard more than it was lawful for man to utter, and, whence he could survey, as his predecessors could not, the earth, in all its extent and all its races and all its history, in the radiance of the glory of God.

Among the slaves and day laborers who formed the main body of Christians in the century, succeeding the death of the apostles, there was a faith as firm and a love for Christ as ardent and a zeal as self-consuming, as that of any subsequent age; but, since only a few could read, and among these few, the entire New Testament was nowhere to be found, and only the manuscript of one or more of its books, was occasionally circulated; and, since, moreover, their access to the written Word was confined almost entirely to the Old Testament, their faith was nourished chiefly through the oral tradition concerning Christ transmitted in the public preaching. The humblest man of the present century who daily reads his Bible, is, in important respects, nearer to the sources, than the great mass of Christians of the Ante-Nicene period. As Christianity became settled as a fixed possession and began to have a history, and as attacks were soon made upon it by trained thinkers, men were raised up to avail themselves of the resources of learning in its defense, and to state the doctrines of Christianity in the scientific, as well as the popular language of the time. The truth of Scripture found manifold applications not only from the

impulse of man's intellectual nature, but also by the pressure of certain great practical problems upon individuals and Christian communities. Holy Scripture was found to be, not a store house of dead facts, but a granary, in which the seeds of a new life were treasured. Every verse, read and laid to heart, was a source and spring of faith and spiritual activity, thus fulfilling the promise, according to which the Holy Spirit not only spake through inspired men, but was to abide with believers forever, in order to lead them into all truth. Hence it follows, that a statement drawn from Scripture, and expressed in other language, is, as to its substance, just as certainly divine truth as the water in a cup is, in quality, identical with that of the fountain, from which it was drawn. The truth offered for our faith, and the truth embodied in the confession, by which we make answer, whether that confession be expressed in a Creed, or a prayer, or a hymn, differ in form but not in matter. It is by a similar process, that we translate the inspired words of the original of the New Testament into those of another language. The life of the Church is thus constantly occupied with the text of Scripture, drawing forth from it, from age to age, ever fresh treasures, one generation advancing upon the basis of that which a preceding generation has attained, or receding as the experiences of its predecessors has been ignored.

The significance of Augustine lies in his more thorough acquaintance with Paul than had his predecessors, and in his more consistent application of Pauline principles. The significance of Luther lies in the fact that, as an earnest student of Augustine, he was led by Augustine to Paul, and, beginning where Augustine had ended, carried through the mastery of the thoughts of Paul, which Augustine had left unfinished. The Reformation is not simply a repristination of Apostolic Christianity, but, by its closer attention to Paul, a positive advance upon anything that the Church had ever before realized.

It was by no conscious effort to reconstruct Christianity, that the Reformation advanced. All restatements of doctrine were forced as the result of conflicts on practi-

cal questions, that could not be avoided, and demanded a clear and unambiguous answer, such as had never been previously heard.

There seems to be special reason why we should apply to-day the question of the relation of the changeless Faith to changing conditions, to the attitude which the Lutheran Church—for whose maintenance this seminary is pledged—should bear to issues claiming attention in this land, and at this time.

When our Fathers at Augsburg presented their Confession, it was not their purpose, be it remembered, to offer to succeeding generations a well-digested summary of the contents of Scripture, adequate, under every circumstance thereafter to arise; but, simply, to meet attacks and gross misrepresentations, then current, with respect to what they taught, by a statement of scriptural truth, limited to such points as were then involved in controversy. Instead of expecting to anticipate the necessity of any farther statements in the future, the Augsburg Confession closes with the words: "We are ready, God willing, to present ampler information according to the Scriptures." The principle involved is that of the perspicuity and sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as the record of God's saving revelation, which, under ordinary circumstances, needs no explanatory statement; and, on the other, the necessity, when the meaning of Scripture, on any particular topic, is questioned or misapplied, for believers, as a part of their Christian calling, as witnesses of Christ in all generations, to give a clear and unqualified answer. The inadequacy of the Oecumenical Creeds, was not because of any desire on the part of the Lutheran confessors, to depreciate their value or to modify their teaching, but solely because entirely new issues had arisen, on which these earlier Confessions were silent. The justification for the Augsburg Confession was, therefore, the new questions that were agitating men's hearts in the Sixteenth Century. When immediately after the Confession was delivered, new phases of the controversy with Rome were urged at Augsburg, and were in the hands of the Emperor, our confessors fulfilled the promise to pre-

sent ampler information according to the Scriptures, not by withdrawing the Confession already published, and revising and enlarging it, to meet the new situation, but by letting what had been already presented stand, as a correct and scriptural answer to the questions before them at the time, and, by adding to it, in the Apology, a similar treatment with reference to the discussion that had succeeded.

Melanchthon's motive in his Variata editions of the Augustana, was, in some respects, most commendable; for it was his aim to rewrite the Confession in such a way as to condense within it the results of the progress that had been attained up to that time, and to give but one Confession to the Church; nevertheless, we cannot be sufficiently thankful, that his plan, which would have required periodical periods of Creed revision, with all the unrest and uncertainty attending them, did not prevail. Where circumstances of time and place require more explicit treatment of the doctrines of the Augustana, let this treatment be embodied in its own special treatise.

What was scriptural at Augsburg in 1530, cannot be unscriptural in America in 1915; but there is no reason, why other relations of the one saving truth, should not be stated in terms adapted to the circumstances of a later age. Must we not regard a Church dead which declines to give its testimony in the terms of the age and land, where it is supposed to live? Is any language which we may repeat, a real confession of our faith, if we are not able to promptly translate it into other forms of expression, in order to bring it more clearly within the intelligence of an examiner? In the Theses of Claus Harms, to which we referred in our opening sentence, he declares that a translation of the Holy Scriptures into a living language must be revised every hundred years, if it is to remain in life. For, as a living language is constantly in motion, old words becoming obsolete, or acquiring new meanings, and new words being introduced, there must be changes in the translation, if it is to convey to a succeeding generation the precise impression that the older translation conveyed to those living in the year in which

it was made. The needle of the compass must be in constant movement, as the vessel threads its way through a tortuous stream, if it is always to point towards the same fixed point in the heavens. We are traitors to the Past, if, upon the foundation which it has laid, we do not build into the Future. We cannot hold our own, unless we advance into new fields.

How vast the difference between the world, in which we live, and that, upon which the cry of Luther, like a second John the Baptist, broke, four hundred years ago! The same earth peopled by the same human race, alike in its sin and misery, in darkened intellect and corrupt affections and perverse will; the same vices and crimes, the same violence and bloodshed, now as then, among those claiming to be followers of the same Prince of Peace. With all the boasted progress of civilization in the last four centuries, the diseases that afflict humanity, have not yet been extirpated. The despotism of monarchs, the presumptions of the Papacy, the cruelty of the Turk, the indescribable horrors of war, the insinuating arts of skepticism, the sensuous worldliness infecting the Church, are the same to-day as then. Scarcely a form of error existed then, which does not have its counterpart to-day.

A people of God, planted in the midst of the corruption, continues to-day as then, to lift up its voice against the sins of the times, offering the same Gospel of the same Crucified and Risen Saviour, and comforted and sustained by the same Holy Spirit, leading them onward to the same eternal rest, and blessing their testimony to the salvation of numberless souls.

But the world has widened. Almost its farthest limits have been explored and races then unknown been reached, not only by the selfish adventurer, but also by the self-sacrificing missionary; the products of every clime are poured into the emporiums of civilized nations; the languages of even the most uncultivated have been reduced to writing; the arts, the literature, the sciences of all countries are the common property of the entire human family.

The world has also narrowed, as well as widened. Modern inventions have drawn men more closely together by improving the means of transit and facilitating the interchange of intelligence by letters and papers, by telegraph and telephone. Representatives of the most widely separated races, dwell side by side in the same cities, each cultivating his own peculiar form of civilization, and contributing his racial ideas to the common stock. Both in cities and even in towns, incongruous religions jostle one another. As the ends of the earth meet here, we need not go to China to learn to know Buddhism or Confucianism; or to India, to study Hinduism; or to the Mosque of St. Sophia, to touch Mohammedanism. Different forms of Christianity, which in Europe, could not dwell in peace within an empire, rejoice in the freedom which they here enjoy, to worship side by side. Their children attend the same schools, are taught by the same teachers, engage in the same occupations, vote at the same polls, read the same daily papers, have the same public interests, and, as they rise together in the social scale, intermarry and blend with one another. Provincialism has given place to cosmopolitanism. Reverence for the past, regard for historical antecedents, respect for what is fixed and established, are constantly undermined by a restless, iconoclastic spirit, with a maniacal antipathy to all that is old and a feverish craving for what is new. The children of the Church, however thorough their religious training, cannot entirely escape the influence of the religious indifferentism, born of the spirit of compromise and conciliation, ever tempting them to gain temporal, at the expense of their eternal and heavenly, interest.

Ever changing systems of Philosophy, make their attempts to unify human knowledge and to reconstruct the universe so as to exclude God and the soul. French Positivism, English Materialism and Russian Mysticism find ready allies in the chairs of German universities, with theories constantly rising, shining with iridescent colors and then fading into nothingness, before something still more recent.

Our much vaunted "non-sectarian" colleges and univer-

sities, and sometimes public schools, violate their profession of colorless neutrality by clandestinely aiding the enemy, and branding the teaching of Holy Scripture as unscientific, while the daily press, in many instances, like the modern novel, popularized through the public library, damages not so much by what is directly taught, as by the suppression of the thought of God and Eternity, and the false ethical standards, according to which judgment is passed.

In the midst of this turmoil, there stand side by side those whom God has raised up as His witnesses for this very crisis, esteeming the reproach of Christ of greater value than the treasures of Egypt, content to be despised in this world, since they know that in the Gospel they have a greater treasure than earth can ever offer. While at heart one, through their common faith in their One Lord, and the common life which they enjoy through His indwelling, they are lamentably often most widely separated. Coming, as they do, from different lands, where they dwelt apart, in which varying degrees of consistency in holding to the one faith, were determined by causes operating far back in the distant past, God's Providential guidance has brought them into close geographical proximity in this new land. Extreme positions, taken by the communions which they represent in former countries and under the strain of bitter controversy, may have been largely modified in individuals, if not in entire religious bodies, by habitual study of God's Word and by the sanctifying agency of God's Spirit dwelling and active in the heart of every regenerate man. Environment also has changed the relative emphasis placed on certain articles. In certain cases what was once central, has moved to the uttermost circumference; and what was once on the circumference, is perhaps now in the very center. The process, of course, works both ways; so that the faith of some is much better than that of their formal confession, while the faith of others falls far beneath it.

Nevertheless, we ask, even where there is most in which we can rejoice, are we ever justified in substituting respect for individuals in place of fidelity to a divine

trust? Dare we elevate the word of even the best of men above, or to the same plane with that of God? That for which we must labor and pray, is not the immediate realization of ideals concerning an externally united Church, but for inner unity of faith and spirit. All attempts, on man's part, to make the external and the internal or real Church, coextensive, must fail. You cannot force into visibility the true mystical body of Christ, of which we speak in the Creed, when we say: "I believe," i. e., "I do not see," but, in the language of the Larger Catechism: "I believe that there is upon earth a holy assembly, composed only of saints, under One Head, Christ, called together by One Holy Spirit, in one person, one mind, and understanding, with manifold gifts, yet one in love, without sects or schisms."

All this is a matter of faith, not of experience. Man's delimitation will always exclude some whom God includes, and include some whom God excludes. Ought we not rather to rest on the divine promise: "The foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this seal: "The Lord knoweth them that are His"?

The members of the Church are ever changing. The line is constantly in motion from the Church Militant to the Church Triumphant. As it moves, some fall by the way, and never reach the goal. But it is re-enforced by constant accessions of new recruits.

Church organizations are subject to the same mutability with the Church itself. Congregations and synods, and still wider groups of Christian people, may have a long history, but they are without the promise of permanency. The Church, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, is nothing but the sum total of those who have and profess the faith of Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Never is the Confession to be adjusted to the demands of any organization; but the organization is to be regulated according to the Confession, or rather according to the Scripture, and its Lord, on which the Confession rests. We do not gather men together, and then decide by a majority vote what the Confession of this body shall be, but the Confession is

fixed, and becomes the test, of those who have a legitimate claim to membership.

The aim of the Augustana, when formulated, was to exhibit clearly what had already been the teaching in our churches;² its employment, as a bond of external union among churches, was subsequent. It was first, a confession of faith, i. e., a declaration of convictions, before it could be made a compact or covenant, uniting men in a religious society. How different a document we would have, if the purpose had been no more than to present a consensus of opinion on the part of those who at the time were dissatisfied with the Roman Church. If it had been no more than the platform of a political party, how numerous the amendments that would have followed from age to age, and country to country, as men and issues changed! How little stability or certainty would have been assured, where creeds would have succeeded each other, with the frequency and transiency of philosophical systems! The strength of the Lutheran Church lies in the stress which it places upon pure Scriptural teaching; its weakness, in its not uncommon entanglement with State Churches, occasioning unwarranted compromises, and preventing the freest expression of its true principles. Its hopes for the future are not for its European form, where it has been both hampered and betrayed, but in America, where it has at last the opportunity to assert its independence of the inconsistencies into which it has been ensnared in its old home, and to return to the purity and simplicity of the first years of the Reformation period. Our theological schools, while stimulating students to cultivate a wide outlook, and according to their calling, to have acquaintance with current discussions, should not encourage them to accept as their guides the highly reputed expounders of manifold forms of scepticism, that assail not only Lutheranism, but all supernatural religion, from the chairs of renowned universities, that assume to be the fountain-heads of all true science. Is it remarkable that Lutheranism is attacked, when the

2 Our churches with common consent do teach. (Art. 1)

critics have often before them not the Lutheranism that is embodied in our Confessions, but what has become so maimed and distorted, that scarcely more than a caricature remains? Can we be surprised that its influence vanishes, when the right to the name is made to rest only on such purely accidental relations as birth and baptism and confirmation within some State Church, which is merely called Lutheran, or some organization in a land of religious liberty, which once had leaders worthy of the name? "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."

A communion designated by some particular form of Church government, may sometimes retain its name, even when its faith is changed; but one whose name designates its doctrine loses its right to the name when it surrenders this doctrine.

National and racial lines are purely incidental to the integrity of the Church. Lutheran and German, are in no way synonymous terms. A Church that cannot bear transplantation and translation, cannot be the Church of the pure Gospel; since the Gospel is intended equally for all peoples and nations. It was the glory of the Reformation, that, instead of a dead language, which only a select few understood, the vernacular of the people, was introduced, as the medium of devotion, wherever the Gospel was preached. When the Latin of the old Roman Church gave way to the German, it was not to substitute a new universal language for a new type of Christianity, but to assert the principle of Pentecost, that every man in his own tongue, wherein he is born, is to hear the wonderful deeds of Christ. Just as the new faith molded the German language and adapted it to religious uses, both on the devotional and the scientific side, so also is it capable of bringing any other tongue and people into captivity to the obedience of Christ. As Christianity is neither Greek, nor Roman, nor German, nor English, nor American, but embraces all, and wears a different cast, at each successive stage of its progress, so Lutheranism, as it passes from Germany to Scandinavia and to America, and as diffused throughout the world by missionary activity,

drops the national characteristics of its former home, in order to adapt itself to its new environment, and to show its oecumenical character and catholic spirit. The chief profit to be derived from supplementing an American, by a European course of scientific training, is not in being brought back to old standards, and having our students set their watches by European chronometers, but in learning to appreciate better what is peculiarly our own, by considering it on the background of another form of culture; just as we learn to know and use our own language all the better by having some acquaintance with other languages. Lutheranism stands and falls, neither with a monarchical, an aristocratic, nor a democratic form of government. Nevertheless, as it appreciates the principles enunciated in Luther's immortal treatise of 1520, on "The Liberty of the Christian Man," and brings to maturity what is involved in the right of private judgment, and the responsibility of the individual directly to God, and the lordship of the Christian over all things, the way is prepared, not indeed, for any violent revolution, but for great political changes, through the silent growth of the seed of the Word in the hearts of both rulers and subjects.

The form of ecclesiastical government according to Lutheran conceptions, must vary, in accommodation to the degree of intelligence of the people, and their manifold historical antecedents—the aim being to instruct them religiously, and thus to secure their harmonious co-operation through evangelical motives touching the heart and conscience, rather than by external constraint, and to rule by law (i. e. the law of love), rather than by any minute and extensive codes of laws, inquisitorial processes and the parade of authority. It is a matter of relative indifference whether the organs of administration be consistories or synods or lay elders or congregational meetings. To diocesan episcopacy, it has no antagonism, except where such episcopacy is urged as a matter of necessity, and a mark of the true Church, or where, underneath its protection the fundamental errors of Rome, and her many anathemas directed against what is central in

our faith are ignored. The highest treasures of art it rejoices in using in the service of God; and, yet, has no scruples in dispensing with them, as circumstances arise. It can worship with equal edification in the most elaborately constructed cathedral, or in a barn or a prison, or the open air. Its high appreciation and edifying use of an historical liturgy does not blind its eyes to the fact that there are occasions for which no liturgy can provide, and when the words of prayer must be the unpremeditated utterances of the moment. Its musical thoughts have found expression in such sublime masterpieces as the interpretations of the Passion of Christ by John Sebastian Bach; but it freely draws from all schools of Church Music, and, if need be, can dispense with music altogether. It has its thousands of hymns in various languages, and its hundreds of sacred poets; but its hymnals include hymns conveying Gospel truth drawn from all sections of Christendom.

Among its members have been many crowned heads and royal families; but it is none the less the Church of the peasantry and the mechanic, the fisherman and the common people. No communion has had on its roll more eminent scholars; and none has brought the comforts of the Gospel to so great a multitude of the illiterate. It represents great wealth and extreme poverty. Its contributions to the press exhibit every variety of literature in richest measure, from transient publications to literary monuments that have stood through centuries. While laying great stress upon the office of the Christian ministry, it knows also how to call into efficient service the active work of laymen, both men and women. In its great congregations, all classes and ages meet; and its public ministrations are directed to the simplest and youngest, since, in matters pertaining to the Kingdom of God, all must become as little children.

As time has advanced, many new features have been introduced into our church life. The rite of confirmation, which for nearly a century and a half, had been discarded, has grown, since its reintroduction by Spener, to be of universal practice, and been given a meaning which

it never had before. When Private Confession had fallen into disuse amidst the confusions of the Thirty Years' War, the Public Service of Confession preparatory to the reception of the Lord's Supper, now in use among us, was adopted from the Reformed Church. Sunday Schools for Bible instruction found general recognition in our churches only after the first quarter of the Nineteenth Century. For nearly two centuries, the theologians wrestled with the knotty problem, as to how to reconcile the constantly growing impulse for activity in Foreign Missions, with their theory of the Call to distinct spheres of ministerial labor, and tried to satisfy the growing demand with the assurance that even without the effort of Christian Churches, when God wished a people to have the Gospel, it would in some way be sent; until, with the restraints that had impeded progress at last broken by the pioneer heroism of Ziegenbalg and his associates, the scruples of those devout and earnest men of the Seventeenth Century, are a matter of astonishment to their successors in the Twentieth. Missions to the Jews, which, in the first period, were deemed a waste of labor, have, in later years, yielded rich fruit, and given to the Christian Church men who have done eminent service for Christ. What the State Churches could not undertake, had to be provided for by the innovation of Missionary Societies, which came into existence to meet a real necessity, whose claims could not be dismissed on the ground of irregularity. The old saying that "the Church itself is a missionary society," no one will dispute; but until the Church be organized for this work, and be about it, some one, or some agency, must take the initiative. The growth of missions, the interest which they awakened, and various agencies which they employed, reacted upon the life of State Churches, and asserted the principle of the importance of the ultimate separation of Church and State. Individuals were raised up, in whom the idea of Inner Missions, and the establishment of institutions of mercy, had to long ripen as mere pious desires, until, with scant outward encouragement, Providence opened up the way for the beginning of their work of faith. What ac-

quaintance had the Reformation period or the Seventeenth or Eighteenth Century, with the mission and work of deaconesses, that has been so signally blessed, since the second half of the Nineteenth Century? The synodical form of church organization, as it has been developed in our Church in America, is far from being a reproduction of certain synodical constitutions existing in the land of our fathers, since their instruments were not for legislative purposes, but for enabling ecclesiastical officials to communicate to those under their rules what consistories had resolved, and to call them to account as to their fidelity or infidelity in fulfilling former orders and instructions. There is, in fact, scarcely a provision of the Church's administration of the Word and sacraments, in which such variations are not traceable. The faith is one and the same; but its application is manifold.³

The Lutheran Church in America can be no prolongation on this continent of the Church of Germany or of Sweden, or of Denmark, or of Norway, or of Iceland. There are communions in America that are no more than appendages to certain ecclesiastical establishments in the Old World. Most true is this of the Roman Catholic Church, which, wherever it exists, stands for an Italian form of Christianity, and is incapable of independent action. Everything is centralized under one earthly head, thousands of miles away. However prelates here may be influenced by American conditions, they are thoroughly subservient to what is determined by the narrow horizon of a prisoner in the Vatican, who, if he could, would subdue all America to Rome.

In a less degree, this is true also of the highly influential body, known as the Protestant Episcopal Church. However earnest may be the all-embracing schemes for Christian unity, which it periodically presses upon the attention of other Christian bodies in America, it is em-

3 Just such emergencies are in view in the confessional declaration of the Formula of Concord, to the effect that the Church of every place and time has the authority to amend, diminish or add to its provisions with regard to adiaphora "as at any time may be regarded most profitable for good order, Christian discipline and edification."

barrassed in its efforts by complications not existing here, but arising from the attitude which the Church of England finds itself compelled to take towards dissenters in the British Isles. However frequent the conferences of American leaders from this communion with representatives of other churches, and however near the approaches that may be made, no break with the Mother Church in England can ever be expected, even though its consideration for Rome be greater than is pleasing to many American churchmen. They cannot act independently as long as the pulse of a foreign power, must be felt before a decision can be rendered. Possibly if all Lutherans in this land came originally from one stock, we might be restricted, to an equal degree, in our adjustment to our conditions; and, yet, we know something of the confusion resulting from an exaggerated regard to national ideals and models inapplicable here. If the land of our fathers had been a great, centralized empire, with an imposing centralized Church, we perhaps would have suffered more. But even those of us of German origin, come originally from numerous principalities, each with its own ecclesiastical establishment. With many, so remote is the time when the change occurred, that I have in mind children, who are in the ninth generation from a patriarch who turned his face westward. Their ancestors in an unbroken line have firmly maintained their position in the Lutheran Church in America, as it has grown from its feeblest beginnings. With the connection with the Mother country sundered more than a century and a half, before the German Empire was born, and a half century, before our own nation achieved its independence, they cannot be expected to have a very close relation to any European community, in which they would have a difficulty to-day to find relatives, as near as seventh cousins.

Nevertheless, we must not forget that a large part of our constituency consists of those whose connection with their European home is recent, and whose tender regard for its associations must be respected.

As a rule, it is only what is common in the regulations and policy of our Church, in the various countries in Eu-

rope, and what is historically rooted in the purer period to which we revert at the Reformation festival, that is of significance to us here. With provincial and nativistic peculiarities eliminated, we are occupied with many problems, belonging exclusively to the New World. What we need is an ever increasing measure of the spirit of Paul, who, when the real meaning of his call as the Apostle to the Gentiles, dawned upon him, was only too glad to sink his Judaism into Christianity, as the stars vanish from sight before the rising of the King of Day.

When, hundreds of years ago, streams of emigrants began to pour upon the Atlantic coast, they were composed of those who were seeking here a home, in which they would be independent of limitations and restrictions, under which they had been suffering in the various countries, whence they came. When they were gathered into colonies and finally organized into States, so vast was the territory and so sparse the population, that it seemed almost as though each State could be autonomous, and, thus, without outside interference, work out its own ideals within its own narrow bounds. When common dangers and common interests aroused them from their isolation, a central government with restricted powers, was deemed all that was needful; and citizens, content heretofore with a country no more extensive than their commonwealth, awakened to the realization of the fact that a new nation had arisen in which their commonwealths were merged and that many claims previously made for so-called States' rights, had become obsolete. For, with the growth of population, the changes from predominantly rural to commercial and manufacturing occupation, and above all with the improvements in means of transit, making it possible for a traveler to breathe the air of four or five States within a single day, and constantly increasing the pressure for uniformity of legislation and administration, such schemes became impracticable. As the national idea grew, we were content with the territory allotted us in this Western Hemisphere; from which, by the earnest advocacy of the Monroe Doctrine, we sought to exclude every interference of European na-

tions, asserting our right to settle issues here, upon the ground that we had no ambition to extend our sway to other lands.

But God, who hath made of one blood all nations of men and who maintains that it is His right and not man's to fix the bounds of their habitations has taught us, that we cannot be an isolated people, and, against our will, has led us onward, until we are at last a great world-power, without imperial aspirations, but, with a vast influence on the politics, the commerce and the finance of the earth. All this has occurred according to no human plan, it has been promoted by the program of no political party, but, through the instrumentality of federal administrations whose tenure is so brief, that no individual has had an absolutely determining influence.

As with the nation, so with the Church. Its lines of progress have not been self-chosen. A break with the Mediaeval Church had never entered Luther's mind, when he made his first move. But once asserted, the premises led to inevitable, even though unexpected, conclusions. When the break came, plans for reorganization were proposed with the greatest caution and deliberation, and, always under the pressure of a necessity that could not be avoided. Much was tolerated that was not approved, but was reserved for amendment when the Church would be ripe for the change. Luther regarded it his duty not so much to aim at the ideal, as to achieve the possible. Each turn in the road opened up a new prospect. Each hour brought its call for a new service. Every new historical occurrence called forth new efforts.

Brought from many countries to this Western land, the absorbing question with our fathers was, first of all, that of being gathered into congregations and supplied with pastors. As groups of congregations were ultimately formed, and were united into synods, local interests were greatly widened. Then, from the earlier centers on our Eastern coast, streams of immigrants flowed to new homes, far south and west. Wave after wave of emigration from the Old World contributed stratum after stratum to our not yet thoroughly assimilated people. As the

masses scattered, Home Missionary interest was stimulated. Colleges, seminaries and general bodies, uniting scattered synods, came into being, where the first attempts were necessarily crude and primitive. Different types of life and activity developed at various centers. But points of contact rendered absolute isolation impossible. Thus, with the one Changeless Faith as the inner bond of union, the approach between them externally, advances, while, notwithstanding many hindrances, the contents of that faith are gradually unfolded, and consistently applied to practice.

The same Hand that wielded our separated States into a nation, and that has led our nation into its path of world-wide influence, is leading us as a Church into an ever deepening consciousness of the fellowship which we have with all true believers in Christ in the past, the present and the future; and bringing us together, around the same confession of the same faith, that, under the guidance of the same Hand, we may be a blessing to this land, and to all its people, and to all communions within it, as well as to all nations and races, even to the remotest ends of the earth. Our sincere acceptance of the faith of the Gospel, however, is one thing; and giving distinct expression to this faith, is quite another. In all our dealings with other communions, or with joint movements, in which they may engage, we cannot act consistently with our calling, unless we have in mind their historical antecedents, as well as the particular forms, in which they meet us here. No high appreciation of the traces of God's grace among them, can justify us in allowing our denominational character to be sunk in theirs. No change in circumstances could allow us to return to the confessional indeterminateness that prevailed in the Lutheran Church of America one hundred years ago, and from which we have emerged only after hard-fought battles, and with enormous losses. Even at the risk of being misunderstood, there are times, when we must be ready to stand alone, and to cultivate the field which God has assigned to us in no other way than according to the approved methods of our Church, which have now stood the

tests of long experience, not in one, but in many lands. Those who denounce us for what they are pleased to call our contracted vision, in not at once, acquiescing in their proposals to surrender what is our own, we should, with all courtesy, ask to respect our preferences, as we do theirs, and, as we pray for God's blessing upon every effort to advance His kingdom, not to forget us in like petitions.

But, as long as the Church to which we belong, is known as Lutheran, it cannot become a member of the Reformed family of Churches, since, from the very beginning, their very existence was a criticism and repudiation of that name. The active Christian life in our congregations, is not advanced, but paralyzed by the confusion of names and methods.

But there is a caution that we must observe on the other hand. Just as earnestly must we guard against a rigorism which is not evangelical, but thoroughly legalistic; which draws deductions out of most remote premises, and knows no flexibility or plasticity, but is more intent upon microscopic examinations to find traces for some obscure disease than upon constructive work. To define in minute rules, applicable to all circumstances, the precise line that runs between these two extremes, is a sheer impossibility. As the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the child of God, illumining the Word of God, when read, and leading into all truth, is a far more trustworthy safe-guard, than all the acute distinctions of casuistry in the text-books of mediaeval writers on "Theologia Moralis"; so for the application of principles to given cases, we must rely on minds illumined by the same Spirit, who have caught the spirit also of our Church and understand the inwardness of the issues at stake, and who, with such general qualifications, can treat with discrimination every proposition as it arises. Who does not realize the difference between a remote and a near view of the same object; between a judgment that is formed from outside information and one that is the result of close observation from within? A favorite maxim of Luther was the old Latin adage, "*Summum jus, summa injuria.*"

Where rights are involved, the Christian method of procedure is by appealing to the equities of the case, and not by the enforcement of all that the letter of the law may exact. It is in the same spirit, that one of our Confessions (the Apology), devotes several pages to showing how "the harmony of the Church cannot last, unless pastors and Churches keep out of view and pardon many things."

The important distinction between the work of organizing comprehensive ecclesiastical corporations for the efficient administration of business interests, and that of bringing together associations for mutual moral support in the maintenance of the same precious faith should always be observed. Is it the main purpose of the Church to teach in its purity the Apostolic doctrine? Or is it to provide for the greatest harmony in the carrying out of resolutions and the enactment and administration of laws? If it be the former, can we not readily enter into a general church union with one another upon a common confessional basis, long before we are ready to adopt precisely the same business methods in the administration of details? Are members of the same Church, within a nation, who hold and profess the same faith, and are laboring for the same ends among substantially the same people, who are persevering against the same discouragements, and defending their position against the same foes, to be separated from each other upon no other grounds than that it would be difficult to merge their business plants? When thoroughly united in the one faith and confession, diversities of gifts and differences of administration, instead of separating, contribute to the highest efficiency of the One Body.

The eye cannot say unto the hand, "I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you."

The time may come when our people may realize, in even greater measure than now, their fellowship in the One Faith. When, then, the causes for our separations will be more fully understood and remedied, we may have from others also a more patient and impartial hearing

for that which we represent, and, through the higher appreciation of the central facts and truths of the Reformation, the way be prepared for a wider union of Protestants. For we cannot but feel that the radical views that have been rampant in recent discussions, will be followed by a reaction, as, after a sufficiently long test, they are found unable to satisfy the demands of man's religious nature and to answer the irrepressible cries of the soul after God. There must be a return to the foundations, if not a rebuilding upon them as never before.

Such hopes we may humbly cherish, without justly incurring the charge of permitting our imagination to run away with our judgment. The different stages by which such results may be attained, we would not attempt to devise.

In God's own time, His plans will be perfected and made manifest.

Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

ARTICLE III.

THE REV. MICHAEL WOLFE HAMMA, D.D., LL.D.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

The subject of this sketch, who passed to the Church Triumphant in June 1913, was born in Richland county, Ohio, December 25th, 1836. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. David Hamma. In his childhood, with his parents, he came to Clark county, Ohio, where his childhood and youth were passed on a farm but a few miles from the city of Springfield which later was to be the place of a fruitful pastorate and the location of the school of theology which at the end of his useful life became the beneficiary of his large interest, affection and gifts. He attended the schools of the community in which he passed his youth, for a time serving as a teacher. He subsequently became a student in Wittenberg College from which institution he graduated in 1861, but a few weeks after the opening of the great Civil War in this country. The period when he was a student at college was a conspicuous period in the history of Wittenberg, for the attendance of a considerable group of young men who subsequently attained to positions of distinction in various lines of activity in Church and country.

The promising young graduate in the days when he was a collegian, gave evidence of those gifts as writer and speaker that later gave him a foremost place among the preachers of our denomination.

Determining to enter the ministry he entered the theological seminary from which he graduated in 1862, entering the ministry in the Miami Synod. His first pastorate was at Euphemia, Ohio. From that place he was called to St. Paul's Church of Bucyrus, Ohio. His pastorate at this place was during the period of the Civil War. Parts of the county in which that town is located, for some reason strongly sympathized with the South, and the

place of a patriotic preacher, such as Dr. Hamma proved himself to be, was not one to be envied in those days. The writer well remembers during his delightful pastorate of eight years with that Church at a later period, many stories that were current about the courageous attitude of the eloquent preacher under trying circumstances. The devoted friendship of the older members of the congregation formed for the pastor in those stirring days continued unabated to the end with those who have passed away and still abides with those who survive.

From Bucyrus Dr. Hamma was called to St. Matthew's Church of Reading, Pa. From that place he was called in 1869 to the pastorate of the First Lutheran Church of Springfield, Ohio, where he remained as pastor for a period of nine years. I may say that this period proved to be a most fruitful and distinguished pastorate. At that time the First Church was our only Church at Springfield. It was attended by the professors and most of the students of Wittenberg College. The Church grew under his ministry and many of the students of those days recall with pleasure and gratitude the contribution made to their lives as they sat under the decidedly inspirational preaching of the able pastor. It was a preaching the character of which was well calculated to inspire young men with a love for public speaking and to quicken within them some estimate of the greatness of the ministry. It was during this pastorate that Dr. Hamma was granted a leave of absence for about one year during which the pulpit was supplied by the late Dr. Jacob Steck. It was then that he did the first of his extensive traveling, going on that trip through parts of Europe, through Egypt, and the Holy Land. Early in 1878 he resigned the pastorate at Springfield to become the pastor of St. Matthew's Church of Brooklyn, New York. From Brooklyn he went to Baltimore, Maryland, where he became pastor of the First Lutheran Church which before him had been served by such well known men as Dr. John G. Morris, Dr. John McCron and Dr. Joseph H. Barclay. This was the last of Dr. Hamma's regular pastorates, but until the end of his

life his services were much in demand as a preacher. He served for a time the First Lutheran Church of San Francisco, Cal., and later the First Church of Altoona, Pa. It was during his ministry at Altoona that the large and attractive Church of that congregation was built, which was a signal feature of his service for that people.

Dr. Hamma traveled much and he had seen, in his time, much of the earth and had spent much time in some of its great centers of historical, religious and artistic interest. He had a discriminating judgment of things that were beautiful and impressive and in his travels had gathered some famous artistic productions which adorned his home. He had descriptive powers of a high order and his travel lectures were realistic, instructive and entertaining.

Dr. Hamma was prominent and influential in the Lutheran Church in this country. For years before his death he was closely identified with all movements looking to unification of the Church of his love and service, in this land. With such movements he was not only closely identified but was in deep sympathy. He served for years on important committees of the General Synod on this subject and in that connection carried on an extensive correspondence and did much work. In 1897 he was honored by being elected to the presidency of the General Synod which met that year in the First Lutheran Church of Mansfield, Ohio. For years he was the president of the General Synod's Board of Home Missions and in the work of that organization he was always deeply interested, contributing liberally of time and money in the prosecution of its special tasks.

But what is likely to prove to be the most conspicuous and enduring service to his Church, Dr. Hamma rendered in the field of theological education.

His name will abide in the Church not only as a preacher, but also because of what he has done for the enlargement and better establishment of the school in which he received his theological training. He was always deeply interested in the training of young men for the

ministry, and to his influence some of them owe their inspiration to go into the noblest of all vocations. In the good Providence of God, Dr. Hamma and his deceased wife, Almira Crothers, came to have means to dispose of. Remembering the needs of the Church and, with a deep love for the school of theology at Wittenberg, they gave to that institution their earthly possessions that in the years to come it might be better equipped for its important work and be an increasing power for good in the evangelization of the world. The work of this school will be greatly advanced because of the wise foresight and deep devotion to the cause of their Lord and Redeemer of these devoted servants of the Church who were generously wise in their day and generation.

In the changes that have taken place in the attitude of this school—and changes there have been—in recent years, Dr. Hamma was a strong influence. At the dedication of the first Divinity Hall, in 1889, he made one of the two principal addresses. It was a memorable occasion and in both of the addresses a decidedly positive and Lutheran note was sounded forth. His interest and sympathy were broad in all that pertains to the welfare and work of our whole Church in this land. His travels especially had given him a cosmopolitan outlook and a high estimate of the faith, the history, the usages and the future of the Church of his love. In those travels he had gone extensively into Lutheran lands beyond the sea, where he had come face to face in the north of Europe, with the worked out results in the Church and civilization of the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. What he had thus gained became a strong factor in his enthusiastic devotion to his Church and its work. He believed in it and its mission with all the ardor of an ardent nature. Nothing pertaining to the unification, the growth and the prosecution of the practical life and work of the Church was alien to his interest. This interest he maintained to the closing days of his earthly pilgrimage, almost to the very last, when the silver cord was loosed and the pitcher broken at the fountain.

In the summer of 1904 the writer in company with Dr. Ezra Keller Bell, of Baltimore, and Dr. Franklin Fry, of Rochester, N. Y., traveled in his company in the Luther lands of Germany and Scandinavia. Each of us recalls with pleasure, now that he is gone from us, his kindling enthusiasm and outbursts of eloquent speech when we came to some place associated with Lutheran piety and achievement, as for instance, when we stood at the spot on the famous field of Lützen near Leipzig, where the brave Lutheran King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, fell in the long conflict for religious liberty, Nov. 6th, 1632, or another day when we stood on the green shores of the lake of Constance at the spot where John Huss was burned July 6th, 1415.

Dr. Hamma was twice married. In 1862, when ready to enter upon his work of the ministry he was united with Almira Crothers, the daughter of the late John P. Crothers, whose memory is perpetuated in the seminary by a beautiful brass tablet placed there by his grand-daughter, Miss Elizabeth McConnell. Mrs. Hamma died in 1904, and is buried at Springfield. In 1906 he was married to Miss Clara Keesy, of Altoona, Pa. To the Church of his faith and service both of these Christian women have shown a beautiful devotion and in its activities both have been prominent and useful and in entire sympathy with Dr. Hamma in all his plans and purposes in advancing the life and work of the Church.

As a place of residence in which to pass the closing years of his earthly pilgrimage Dr. Hamma selected Springfield. Here not far from the scenes of his youth, within sight of the college where he received his education, and the theological seminary building that bears his name, and hard by the city cemetery where at last his dust was to rest until the resurrection of the just, he passed his last days.

He fell asleep June 3rd, 1913, being at the time of his death in his 77th year. The funeral services were held at the Fourth Lutheran Church of which he was a member. They were in charge of the pastor, Dr. S. E. Greena-

walt and were participated in variously by Dr. C. E. Gardner, pastor of the First Lutheran Church, Dr. W. L. Guard, President of the Miami Synod, Drs. J. H. Culler, S. P. Long and B. F. Prince, the senior member of the Wittenberg Faculty. Addresses were made by Drs. C. G. Heckert and D. H. Bauslin, the former the President of Wittenberg College and the latter Dean of the Seminary. The pall bearers were seminary professors, Drs. Tressler, Larimer, Neve and Keyser, and the Hon. John L. Zimmerman and Dr. D. K. Gotwald.

Dr. Hamma was a man widely known personally and for his deep interest in everything pertaining to the life and work of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in this country. To his friends he was warmly attached and his departure entailed upon all such a deep sense of personal loss.

To those who knew him as long as the writer he will stand out most prominently as a preacher. In this he always magnified his office and to the work of the pulpit brought gifts of an unusual order. The writer feels that by the common consent of all who knew him and have heard him he will be assigned a place among the best preachers of his denomination in his day in this country. When I entered Wittenberg College the subject of this tribute was the pastor of the First Lutheran Church of this city. He was then under 40 years of age. For a period of about seven years it was my privilege for most of that time to hear him every Sunday. With others who, in those days of our boyhood and youth, came under the spell of that ministry there lingers the memory of a man with a keen and penetrating eye, raven-like hair, one possessing a voice with scope, searching power and pathos, who, from Sunday to Sunday, ascended the pulpit of that historic church and who, on occasion, inspired us with unique and eloquent discourses. I recall his rare powers for graphic portrayal, his realistic and intense presentation of the message of life and salvation. These powers, somewhat modified in some of their aspects, were enriched as he grew older. In my later studies in the his-

tory of the pulpit, I have come to look upon Dr. Hamma as in a very considerable sense, in his own peculiar gifts, as the Thos. Guthrie of the Lutheran pulpit in my day. He grew old, but even down to the last sermon I heard him preach there were to be discerned the old-time fire and the fine pulpit gifts which made a commanding preacher of the younger man. His friends honor the memory of a good and true man whose earthly work is now ended.

Hamma Divinity School,

Springfield, O., Dec. 1915.

ARTICLE IV.

DEDICATION OF HAMMA DIVINITY HALL.¹

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

To-day has brought us to an hour of joy and triumph in the history of this school. We are here rejoicing in the tangible evidences of that manifest care and watchful oversight which the Head of the Church has had for this vine of His own planting and which, in the years that have ensued since its founding, has, as we are pleased to think, been a not unimportant factor in the enlargement of His kingdom.

Seventy years ago our fathers in the faith and in the serious and earnest spirit which pervaded them, for the furtherance of the Gospel and that the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which had its beginnings in the revolt against the abuses of the papacy, in the 16th century, and which had been transplanted to these shores by our denominational pioneers, in the 17th and 18th centuries, might have a properly trained and qualified ministry, founded this school in this place beautiful for situation and adaptation to its uses.

Our denomination is no offshoot of some secondary sect. Our fathers came out from the Church of Rome in the first of the Reformation days. From the first they planted their feet on the only consistent, and conservative Protestant ground. They had felt the heavy hand of the papal authority, backed by the whole world-power, but in the face of both have waged the long and successful conflict against sacramentalism, sacerdotalism, ecclesiasticism, externality, and formalism in religion. In this land they laid the foundations of a Church which throughout its long history has stood consistently for the

1 An address delivered at the dedication of the Hamma Divinity Hall, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, Thursday, November 11th, 1915, by Professor David H. Bauslin, D.D., Dean of the Seminary.

material principle of the Reformation, justification by faith alone; for the formal principal of the Reformation, or the supremacy of the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; for the social principle of the Reformation, or the universal priesthood of all believers, and for that other principle vital to all true Protestantism as well as democracy, the right of private judgment. On the basis of that apprehension of the Gospel which puts Christ before the Church and which makes christliness the standard of sound churchliness, that which emphasizes freedom in Christ as contrasted with a Judaizing legalism; that of inward experience and personal conviction as contrasted with outward institutions, sacerdotal mediations, and obedience to authority; that which is mainly subjective and which makes of religion a personal concern, as contrasted with that which is objective and which sinks the individual in the Church; that which emphasizes immediate communion of the soul with Christ through personal faith as contrasted with that system of mediate communion with Christ through the Church and the interposition of a long list of subordinate mediators and advocates; and that which insists upon an efficacious interpretation of the means of grace as contrasted with empty symbolism and memorialism.

In the name and upon the basis of such an apprehension of the Gospel, our fathers planted this seminary, and as the years have come and gone, one after another, at critical times in its history, friends who have shared in the confession of such religious beliefs have been raised up to provide the means for its better equipment and enlargement, until to-day bearing the name of one of its own loyal sons and its chief benefactor, it stands before our grateful eyes as one of the best equipped among the schools of theology in our beloved Church, looking hopefully into the future with the confident expectation that then as now and at its beginning, it may rest securely upon the foundations which endure and to maintain in its fulness and integrity the faith once for all delivered into the saints.

When our Lord was here on the earth He set before Himself three fundamental tasks. First of all He lived a life, such a life that He could say, with no touch of egoism, "I am the way, the truth and the life. He that hath seen Me hath seen God. He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." This old world hitherto had not seen it after that fashion. It had never seen goodness made interesting, vital and dynamic as Jesus had made it in the life which manifested God and since that manifestation the world has been constantly taking on a different aspect, and with some temporary reversions has moved upward toward a better state.

In the second place, our Lord proclaimed a kingdom, a kingdom that should inaugurate a new order of life, and set up the rule of another spirit even the spirit that was in Him. He painted the standards of that kingdom on the sky which overarches this troubled world so that they will never fade out and proclaimed the unique truths of that particular form of a kingdom that was to have no end. We live to-day and move and have our places of opportunity and responsibility in the ideals of that kingdom.

And then, again, when the shadows began to lengthen, and our Lord saw that it was toward evening, even where the shadows of the cruel cross and the awful transactions on the coming Calvary were stretching out before Him, He gave the best strength of the last two years of His earthly career to the training of a small group of leaders. He did not busy Himself in addressing the multitudes, nor in the writing of a book, He did not give His attention to the shaping of a ritual, nor to the perfecting of an ecclesiastical organization, that was to maintain in its identity for all times and conditions, but He rather went apart and gave Himself to training a small company of competent leaders. They were to go out to conquer the then known world, charged with His ideas, saturated with His spirit and empowered with those supernatural and overcoming energies which had made His own divine life strong and His influence so abiding.

Christ knew at the inauguration of His kingdom among

men that the truth of the Gospel of redemption could not be written in a book, that it could not be adequately displayed in stately liturgical practices nor projected in some elaborate and carefully articulated piece of ecclesiastical machinery. It must be embodied in a life. The Father hath sent Me, and I send you." The Father projected His love and life into that ancient Palestine when He sent His Son. Now Christ would send His love and His life into every country of the world by sending qualified men who have caught His spirit, believe in the absoluteness of his message and who have a compelling desire to proclaim the great salvation to a world that had fallen under the dominion of the evil one. "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." To make that small band of men worthy to be thus sent as the accredited ambassadors of an everlasting kingdom became the supreme concern of our divine Lord's heart and plans.

Now the stern necessities of the situation where we find ourselves to-day forces upon us the same high task and lifts it to the same place of primacy in the undertakings of the Church. Our fathers seventy years ago grasped the significance of the problem of furnishing the Church with a competent, trustworthy and efficient leadership for the advances it is always called to make. To-day as then the same grave necessity is upon us, for ours is a time when this is the gravest problem the Church is facing. "I sought for a man to stand in the gap." The cry is as old as the time of Ezekiel, and it comes to us with an ever-increasing urgency that rests alike upon young men, upon families and upon the schools founded and nourished by the Church. The main problem of the city Church and the main problem of the country Church is to find a man to lead that body of Christian impulse which can be readily awakened into action by the touch of a competent and consecrated leadership.

The original meaning of a theological seminary is to be found in this, that it is a school established for the training of men who have given their lives in an undivided devotion to propagate the message and power of the Christian Gospel. Christianity is not a vague term for religion

in general, suffused with the ethical teaching and spirit of Jesus. It claims to be supremely and directly the act within the human soul of a personal God who has redeemed our race to eternal life through the incarnation, the atoning death and the glorious resurrection of His Son Jesus Christ. That seems to me to be the brief statement of the objective, the historical fact. That is the description of Christianity which no student of religion can avoid making, if he would state what Christianity has been and is, historically and characteristically among the other religions of mankind. Our fathers founded this school and its friends have given of their means to equip and enlarge its sphere of influence, for the purpose of proclaiming the nature and spreading the influence of this particular form of religion which consists in the good news to mankind of the love and mercy of God in Jesus Christ, as that particular form of religion is apprehended and confessed by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers. For this end all of its equipment has been arranged, its organization of instructors, its treatment of students, its whole atmosphere alike in the pursuit of scholarship and in the direction of practical conduct and aims, is created by this its distinctive and definite origin and purpose. Its controlling body of directors should always consist of men for whom the Church of Christ is the most real and glorious and divine influence among men, and who count it a privilege, a duty, and a joy to serve it with wisdom, devotion and strength.

Such a school, set apart as this one, is not simply to make men scholars, but to so train them as to make acceptable and efficient preachers of the Gospel must show some capacity for adaptation. The men who serve here now and those who shall come here after as their successors, must know how, as has been said by one of our guests on this occasion, and who has just preceded me on this program, Dr. Jacobs, to "speak the language of the time and place where Providence has placed them." Our age is not that of Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas or even of Luther, but the twentieth century and the school of theology of to-day is not the school of Alexandria or

Antioch, though we still much need the critical spirit of the one and the practical spirit of the other, for the thorough training of the American preacher who is to serve in an American Church and under American conditions in proclaiming to men the one unchanging Gospel, adapted in its letter and spirit equally to the first, fifth, sixteenth and twentieth centuries. There should be to-day no less language, no less history, no less of theology, but in this intense commercial and pragmatic age men must be taught to look at life through all such accomplishments of the preacher, face to face, and in a practical way interpret and practically apply the truth of an unchanging Gospel to the needs of sinning, sorrowing, suffering and needy men in their daily thinking and living.

Considering the fundamental nature of its work in the Church, in its existence, enlargement and growth in the Christian graces in these days of special and large giving our theological schools should not be forgotten. Their claims upon the sympathy and support of the Church should be fully recognized. The greatness of the work wrought by and through them in the past should not be forgotten. Their great possibilities for future good should be safeguarded by larger endowments, by an increase of the teaching force and by improvements in methods, so that they may not only hold the position they now occupy but steadily grow in ability and usefulness, and in the future as in the past, be as fountains from which there shall flow forth those refreshing streams of evangelical influence in co-ordination with sanctified learning, that shall gladden the city of our God.

It is desirable, important, indeed to have educated laymen for positions of responsibility in the Church, but it is essential to have a thoroughly trained ministry. The effectiveness of the Church is the effectiveness of her leaders, not solely but largely.

I deem it befitting here that I should on this occasion say something of the history of the school. The beginnings date back to 1845. At a meeting of what is now known as the East Ohio Synod, held in 1842, a resolution was adopted to the effect that an institution of literary

and theological learning, be established. In 1843, in harmony with this resolution of the preceding year, an academic school was started at Wooster. In 1844 another step was taken toward the actual beginning of Wittenberg College and Seminary, in the election of the Rev. Ezra Keller, D.D., of the Maryland Synod, he being at the time of his election pastor of the venerable St. John's Church at Hagerstown. In 1845, Doctor Keller visited different points in Ohio with the view of a permanent location for this institution. Being himself a Marylander, and finding at Springfield and in the country surrounding a goodly number of Lutherans from Frederick and Washington counties of that State, and having received here what he judged to be a good financial assurance, this institution was permanently located in this city and on the handsome slopes of this attractive campus. In the spring of 1845, with very humble and modest beginnings the college and seminary began their courses of usefulness as factors in the life of the Lutheran Church in this country.

The first sessions of the new school were held in the basement of the old First Lutheran Church at High and Factory streets.

From his diary of July 8, 1845, we learn the spirit animating the pious founder of college and seminary and his hopes for the unfolding future of these feeble beginnings. "Yesterday," says he on that date, "I aided the building committee in marking out the site of our college edifice. As I stood upon the spot, the following inquiries arose in my mind: Shall I ever see a building erected here and young men occupying it, with a desire and zeal to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ? Shall I be permitted to see ambassadors of Jesus, equipped for their Master's service, going out from this spot on errands of love and mercy, and breaking the bread of life to the perishing?" Leaving behind him a singularly deep impress as a preacher wherever he was known, and widely lamented, Dr. Keller died Dec. 29th, 1848, when he was but 37 years of age. He was succeeded by the beloved Dr. Samuel Sprecher who at the time of his election was the pastor

of the First Lutheran Church at Chambersburg, Pa. Dr. Sprecher was a teacher at Wittenberg for a period of 35 years and left an abiding influence upon the school and a multitude of young men who came in the years of their tutelage under the singularly powerful influence of this great man.

The range of the studies pursued in their early years and the time embraced were both limited. Didactic Theology, Church History, Homiletics, Pastoral Theology, together with the Christian evidences, some Hebrew and Greek, comprised the list of subjects. A few branches of study, a few months of time included in the course and one professor were included in the beginnings of this school in the days when our godly and self-sacrificing fathers were laying the foundations of what is now known as "The Hamma Divinity School." Here as elsewhere the founders were almost obliged to make brick without straw. They nevertheless did their work well, perhaps better than their successors could have done had they lived in their time and wrought in their places.

In 1849, Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad was called to be a second professor in the seminary. He remained for about four years when he became pastor of the First Lutheran Church of Dayton, Ohio. From that time again until 1864, the seminary had but one instructor, when Dr. Joel Swartz, of Baltimore, Md., was called to a professorship. He also remained about four years when he became pastor of the First Lutheran Church of Cincinnati. Again for a period of six years Dr. Sprecher was the only teacher. In 1874 Dr. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, was called from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the chair of "Sacred Philology." He occupied this position until 1880, when he resigned to go to Germany to pursue philosophical and sociological studies. In 1880 Dr. Samuel Alfred Ort was chosen to succeed Dr. Stuckenberg. The school then had two teachers, both men of unusual ability and impressiveness as teachers in the persons of Drs. Sprecher and Ort. The length of the course of study was at that time two years, and so remained until 1889, when it was advanced to

three years, the period for a course in theology in most of the theological schools of the land.

In 1885, Dr. J. W. Richard was called to a chair in the seminary, in which position he remained until 1889, when he became Professor in the seminary at Gettysburg. At that time a decided forward step was taken in the selection of two men of fine equipment for the positions they were called to fill, Dr. Luther A. Gotwald, then pastor of the Second Lutheran Church of Springfield, a man of noble spirit and deep devotion to the faith and work of our Church was called to the chair of Practical Theology. A new chair of Exegetical Theology was established, to which Dr. Samuel F. Breckenridge, the able professor of Mathematics in Wittenberg College, was called. Dr. Breckenridge was a scholar of wide attainments, and as many can testify, a rare teacher. These three devoted and able men, Gotwald, Breckenridge and Ort, who did so much for the later development of the seminary, now rest from their labors, each in his turn having died in peace and in Christ.

The first building to be used exclusively for the work of the seminary was erected in 1889, chiefly through the timely gift of Dr. and Mrs. Hamma. In December 1900, this building was destroyed by fire. The present more beautiful building now enlarged and to be known henceforth as "Keller Hall," being named in honor of the founder of the school, and to be used as a home for our students, was built in 1901.

The faculty at present consists of the President, Dr. Charles G. Heckert, the Dean, Dr. David H. Bauslin, the Professor of Historical and Practical Theology, Dr. V. G. A. Tressler, the Prof. of the New Testament, Prof. L. H. Larimer, the Professor of the Old Testament, Dr. J. L. Neve, Professor of Symbolics and the History of Doctrine, and Dr. L. S. Keyser, the Professor of Theology. Dr. Bauslin succeeded Dr. Gotwald in 1896, and the others have come in this order since: Dr. Tressler, Dr. Larimer, Dr. Neve, and Dr. Keyser.

This faculty is composed of men who are yet in their prime. They are in theological harmony, devoted to the

Church in which they have been called to serve, and enthusiastic in the lines of work included in their several professorships. The seminary at the present time has a fine body of devoted and promising young men in its student body. Without any ambiguity or uncertainty this "school of the prophets" stands for the historical faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, for its cultus and its methods of Christian work.

On this basis it is hopeful and confident of an opening future of influence and growing usefulness as a school set apart for the training of young men for leadership in the kingdom of our Lord, the Head of the Church.

I deem it appropriate for this occasion that I should say something about some of the friends of the school who, by their gifts have made its existence and enlargement possible. Chief among the friends of this seminary, in the period of its earlier history were the late Frederick Gebhart and later and for a long period his son, the late Alexander Gebhart. In its later history four names stand conspicuous among those who have made provision for that unto which we have now attained; whose splendid and timely benefactions have given us in buildings and endowment that which was urgently needed. These persons are the late Dr. Michael Wolf Hamma and his wife, the late Almira Crothers Hamma, the late Rev. Charles Stroud, and Mrs. Elizabeth Aultman Harter of Canton, Ohio. These Christian people have done so much to make of this seminary what it now is and to insure for it an expanding sphere of usefulness in the future, that they are each and all worthy of our grateful remembrance and recognition at this time and place, and in the entire Church to which they have shown such wise and affectionate devotion. At her home, and among all who knew her elsewhere, Mrs. Harter is known as a real philanthropist in many lines of Christian undertaking. She is honored among us as one of the noble Christian women of our Church and one of the faithful among the stewards of the Lord. In 1894 she endowed the chair in the seminary then filled by the late Dr. Luther Gotwald and known as the "George D. Harter Chair

of Historical Theology." This foundation is a loving memorial of her departed husband, the late George Dewalt Harter, one of the Church's most devoted, intelligent, and spiritually-minded laymen. Before the endowment of this chair and for some years she and the late Michael D. Harter, proved themselves by their generous gifts, to be friends greatly needed at a critical period in our history.

The late Rev. Charles Stroud did not fill a conspicuous place in the ministry of the Church, which he loved. His interest in the Church and its work was wise and deep enough to induce him years before his death to provide, that for its "better equipment," as he himself states it in his last will and testament, this seminary should forever have for its use his valuable estate. The seminary chair occupied by Dr. Tressler bears his name, while the seminary library fund is named in honor of his deceased wife, the "Clara Stroud Library Fund."

Dr. Hamma and his deceased wife, out of their deep love for the Church and the school in which he had received his training, gave their possessions of valuable property to further the cause of theological education in the Church in which both of them had for years been known as liberal contributors and devoted laborers. The seminary yet has great needs to place it in the rank of some similar schools in the land, but the large and timely gifts of these two servants of the Lord so wisely disposed, mean great things for the future of theological education in the Lutheran Church. It is a pleasure for me to state that his wife, who survives him, is continuing in her life and interest the same devotion to the seminary shown by Dr. Hamma when he lived. Of this honored son of the Church and graduate of this school in the class of 1862, I may say an additional word of appreciation of one to whom I owe much. When I first knew Dr. Hamma I was a boy entering college, and he the preacher at the First Church of this city. He was then a young man with raven hair and penetrating eyes, and in public address capable of that graphic and picturesque power in speech which gave him his distinction as one of our ablest preachers. His preaching, to which it was my privilege

to listen from Sunday to Sunday, in those formative years, became a part of my education, and to-day I esteem it a matter of great personal gratification that I hope to spend the days of the years of the remainder of my earthly pilgrimage in a school of Christian learning that bears his name. Dr. Hamma's contribution to this seminary has been one not only of means but also one of large influence. No one who knows its history would deny that theological and ecclesiastical changes have taken place here. A Lutheran consciousness now maintains that did not prevail in earlier days. Great changes have been effected in the body with which we are connected. In those changes this school has been no unimportant factor, and they in turn have not left us unaffected. In his own way Dr. Hamma was closely identified with those changes, as he himself, with many of his brethren, moved on from the more ambiguous and uncertain Lutheran attitude of his earlier years in the ministry, to the more certain and positive position in which he rejoiced in his later years and in the faith and hope in which he died.

The beautiful library building used alike by the College and Seminary, has been erected by the family of which our devoted friend, the treasurer, Mr. John L. Zimmerman, is an honored member. It stands as a fitting memorial to a graduate of the seminary in the class of 1876, the Rev. Joseph Clark Zimmerman, a man of beautiful devotion to the Church and of tireless energy, who also passed from the Church on earth mourned by all who knew him in the days of his young manhood, and in the midst of hopes unfulfilled, when he was the energetic secretary of our Board of Church Extension.

I have it in my heart, and as I deem it appropriate to this glad occasion, so quickening to gratitude, to say a few words about a group of men whom I have known and honored, men who have made large contributions each in his way, to the life of Wittenberg College and Seminary.

As the primate among these I should name Dr. Samuel Sprecher who at the end of his long earthly pilgrimage of over ninety-five years, passed to the endless life Jan. 10, 1906, with honor and distinction accorded to but few men.

As theologian, philosopher, teacher, preacher, seer, saint, counselor, citizen and man, he stands in the memory of all who came within the range of his singular influence, marked by elements of his personality, for certain eminent intellectual, moral and spiritual factors which will forever remain with us as a priceless heritage. Who that can recall his capacity to make the most subtle thinking a matter of personal interest, that tender and pathetic voice, his humility of spirit as a disciple of his Lord, his habitual reverence in attitude and speech toward sacred things, his keen metaphysical insight, his disinterested devotion to the best things of which men are capable, his power of extemporaneous expression, and his inspiring teaching; who of the alumni and all others of his period of service covering three and a half decades, will think of themselves, in large part, as other than what they are, because of what Dr. Sprecher was and gave to them. Neither lapse of years nor length of distance can close or bound the influence of that remarkable career. He too in the years of his rich maturity, passed on from that position of Lutheran indefiniteness of his earlier years—a period of deterioration, uncertainty and compromise in the history of our Church in this land—and in brief but now famous declarations published in 1891 and 1892, bore his testimony in unmistakable definiteness saying, "I can now say as I could not formerly, that like Spener, I can for myself accept the symbols of the Church without reserve." In this affirmation he gave aid and comfort and reassurance to many of his best students into whose lives he had entered so largely, and from whose great influence they had inherited such valuable possessions.

Into this group should go the name of Dr. Samuel Alfred Ort. To those who knew him it need not be said that Dr. Ort was a man of unusual mental strength. Few men have been so well equipped intellectually for the work of teaching upon the most exalted themes of human consideration. His special intellectual gifts were philosophical. It was in philosophical study and its applications in the interpretation of religious problems, that he was most distinguished as a teacher, and in the-

ology nothing was more marked than his sense of the unity of knowledge. The mind for him was the instrument for the unification of all the truth within man's reach. When he came to deal with the writings of such as Kant, Hegel and Fichte, von Hartman, Schopenhauer and Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Hermann, and Spencer, his mind was big enough to weigh them in its own scales and to be its own authority upon them. He had a noble enthusiasm for working in lofty fields of truth, understanding many of the great problems of human thinking and penetrating far into the processes of the human mind, impressing himself strongly on young minds who came under his instruction. He was a man of strong faith and the Christian facts became the prime realities of his life. The central and leading realities with him were the incarnation of our Lord and His redemptive work. Around the great truth of justifying faith he co-ordinated his theological thinking and teaching.

With the passage of years and with increased study he came more and more into a full and happy acceptance of the great theological system of his Church. On one occasion, and late in the night when several of us who had been his students, when all of us were much younger, were in his company in the old seminary building, before its destruction by fire, taking from his table one of the well-worn volumes of Dr. Jacobs' earlier edition of the "Book of Concord," he said to us in the familiar speech of earlier days, "Boys the longer I live and study, the more assured I feel that in this book we have a system of theology so biblical and well-stated, that it needs no revision."

Living and dying a poor man, he had devoted his fine gifts solely to the work of preacher and teacher and with a devotion to the Church that was deep and joyous.

Into this group with a sad sense of the loss we sustained when he passed away in 1911, I place the name of a third, Dr. Samuel Franklin Breckenridge. When we carried him to his grave, on a day long to be remembered by many of us with a sense of personal loss, all of the Church did not know it, but there passed from our midst

one of the finest scholars among us in his day and generation.

He served the College and Seminary with unfailing ability and fidelity during the years of his life among us, bringing to his work the resources of a broad and exact scholarship. He was made for fellowship and friendship. His humanity was ample and always accessible. As a teacher he was exacting and woe to the student who made a futile effort at bluffing in his lecture room, in the place of what he should have brought after patient and diligent application. But there was about him as a man such a genial depth and simplicity of nature, a kindliness in eye and voice that made of him always a most companionable man and a teacher both admired and loved. In the day of battle for the truth as he apprehended it on a wide range of subjects, he knew how to contend, and the man who encountered him as a disputant must come with good credentials or leave the field with trailing banners.

Versatile in his attainments as linguist, mathematician, logician, historian, and student of civic and economic problems, he was a most profitable friend and companion. But he was more than all this, for back of the teacher, scholar and merciless exponent of the weak joints in the other man's argument, was the spirit of a Christian who felt in his own experience the power of the truths of the New Testament which in his later years he so much loved to teach.

During the period of his declining health preceding his death, and when he knew that the shadows were deepening, it was my sad opportunity to watch him closely. More and more I came to think of him as one than whom I had known none to have a stronger grasp upon and firmer faith in the great realities and comforts of saving faith. He loved his Greek Testament and knew it well. In the great doctrines of Grace he found the philosophy that controlled his thinking and his inspiration as a teacher, of enthusiasm and efficiency, even unto the day when, falling by the wayside on his way up the hill to

hear one of his classes, he was not for God had touched him and taken him.

In the opportunities I have had in a long period, to observe the life of this institution I have had ample reason to place in this list of men who have passed from us, another name of one to whom it owes much. I mean the name of the late Dr. Luther A. Gotwald. His coming to a chair in the seminary after a long period of widely recognized usefulness in the pastorate, the later development of the school has shown, I am sure, to have contributed to its life something of Lutheran depth of piety and unambiguous relation to the Lutheran apprehension of the Gospel that made a contribution of much usefulness. In the period of his connection with the seminary, in consequence of that diligent and methodical application which marked all his labors, he did a vast amount of work that abides.

When orthodoxy called Dr. Gotwald always rang true. When humanity presented its demands he sympathetically responded. He was a fine Homeletician and in his preaching there was method united with that unction that goes home to the heart. When he was a pastor he made a deep impression in all the places where he had wrought in the name of his Lord. Where the soul was sick there he was with the spiritual panacea, an inspiring, untiring, devoted man of God. To controversial theology he was averse by temperament and inclination, but latitudinarianism in a general or in a Lutheran sense had no place in his thinking or conduct. Sweetness and not bitterness, he thought, accomplished most in vindication of "the faith, once delivered to the saints."

In a day that tried men he could stand, but love, Christian love, human love, gave the keynote to his life. In his day he was a wholesome, kindly force in this school. His record is not only on high but in every pastorate he served and in this seminary to the service of which he brought industry and a loving heart in the concluding years of his rich life.

Recalling as we do to-day the labors and sacrifices of these men who have in turn passed from us, having died

in peace and in Christ, the benefits of whose toil we inherit, leads me to place in this list of worthies in the history of this place, the name of one among us who has been the contemporary, the associate and fellow-laborer of all of them. In grateful acknowledgment of the gracious goodness of our God, who has spared him in vigorous strength of body and mind, to prosecute among us his many tasks, I should place in this list of noble men to whom this school owes a great debt of gratitude and affection, the name of our senior colleague and co-worker, Dr. B. F. Prince. While never filling a chair in the seminary, he has trained more preachers than any of us in his long career at this place. During a longer period than has yet been accorded to anyone in Wittenberg history, he has brought to his tasks as teacher and overseer of many things, an untiring devotion and a soundness in judgment, that have made of him one of the most familiar figures not only about the place, but one of the most useful factors in the life and work of college and seminary. Those of us who can recall for years his sturdy Christian manhood, his fidelity to all his tasks in school, Church and the community, his modesty and the solidity of his attainments, together with the watchful attention given to the erection of this building cherish the hope that there are yet for him years of service in our midst, as friend, colleague and fellow-servant in the work of our Lord and Master, who hath redeemed us all and given us our places of service in His Church.

These men, in the estimate I have come to place upon them through years of close association, in the work of this school, would have constituted a group in the sphere of Christian education such as would have honored any institution in the land of the most ample endowment and equipment.

Of these men I have spoken what was in my heart to say and what I have felt ought to be said on this glad day of rejoicing in fulfilled hopes. I have known all of them well. They have been my teachers, my colleagues, my counsellors and my friends; men who have quickened in me a desire after the best things to which men may devote

themselves; those whom I have been pleased to honor as men who have wrought well in days that are gone in laying the foundations and giving direction to the life of a school, which has been a great factor in the life and work of our beloved Church and in the hastening of the kingdom of Him whose we are and whom we serve.

We who are here to-day are wont to think that the institution has not lost the spirit of fervent piety into which it was baptized in its infancy, and that the stamp of religious character which was impressed upon it at the beginning has not been altogether effaced.

The theological school is of divine origin and should accordingly command our respect and interest and also sympathetic support. Not only was this seminary divinely ordained but it was also humanly needed. The fundamental equipment for the ministry has long been familiar and is not in the least likely to be changed by the lapse of time. It is well for us in these days of rapidly multiplying pedagogical and other innovations and departures from the old paths, to remember what a school of theology exists for, why it has been in the past construed as such an important factor in the life of the Church. The exponent of reconstruction in our day has come to look upon the traditional training in schools of this order as a kind of Saul's armor that drags heavily and has become a burdensome imposition upon pious young men. It has even been proposed to place on the scrap heap the accredited seminary curriculum as a thing of futility and inaptitude and establish an up-to-date system that will be of a piece with the pedagogical experiments inflicted so widely upon the secondary school and college together with the tentative sociological ventures of popular unrest. For the Protestant world the form of ministerial training is finally established by the fact that the supreme work of practically every minister must always be that of preacher. Let the Churches become careless about the quality of their preachers, let the seminaries become superficial and short-breathed in the work of preparing men for the work of proclaiming the Gospel, and we shall see the intelligence of the land slip gradu-

ally but steadily out of the Churches. Mankind, after all is mastered by the mind. It is what men think and proclaim that makes the substance of human history. And they who would make the highest of human history through that highest which God has given to us in Christ, must have minds severely, deeply, constantly disciplined to think the best and to proclaim that best with the utmost power.

But the school must first of all have the men to train for the high task of spiritual leadership. We may say to the Churches in a sense, not contemplated by the Lord himself perhaps, "With what measure you mete it shall be measured to you again."

There are two main sources of supply, the Christian home and the Christian college. The true line of apostolic succession does not run as a rule through the mystic touch of the official hands of some titled ecclesiastic, as he passes on the gift of power,—it runs more often through the tender, beautiful, intimate piety of some woman who becomes the mother of a prophet.

I fear that in this restless, hurried life of ours that valid source of supply is not being adequately maintained.

The other main source is the Christian college. Many of the great historic universities, and many of the state universities are saying to this call for spiritual leadership, "It is not in us." The percentage of graduates from these splendidly equipped schools is pathetically small. The subtle, tender spiritual impulses which might carry men into this high form of service fall there by the wayside and the birds of secular interest devour them. In these days we must look directly to those colleges where the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is not "officially recognized," as the chilly catalogue might announce, but in the whole life of the institution is steadily exalted to its rightful place of supreme concern.

I deem it proper that I should say before this building is once for all set apart for its holy uses, that the members of the faculty at this place, are engaged in inventing no new Gospel, but are doing what they can to equip young men to defend, declare and apply the old.

One of the chief dangers of our day is the easy and irresponsible way in which some institutions slip from the authority of the past, defy the message of accumulated experience, and launch out upon a sea floating with unproved hypotheses and profitless assumptions. We have here no war to wage on the accepted and real results of a sound scholarship. But we are not content in the name of what are alleged sometimes to be the "accepted results" of scholarship, to have some sophisticated Barabbas thrust upon us instead of the Lord from Glory. We are not prepared to admit to these halls a desupernaturalized Gospel and a human Jesus who was the founder of a world conquering religion.

We have no desire to train young men at this place to go limping into the conflicts of their day weakened by modifications and compromises. We want to be open-minded and charitable to all scholarship of a sane and approved type; abreast in all social progress and in the practical application of Christian principles to the problems of labor and capital, to the government of cities, to the welfare of State and Nation, but we propose still to hold fast to that type of faith and religious life which puts the emphasis first on the redemption of man and on the agencies which are sent of God to enrich and foster man's spiritual life. We still believe to-day at this place that history has a message for us—and that it is this, to teach us to hold on to our faith in the old doctrine of an inspired Bible, in the old ideas of the fall and redemption, the old warnings of judgment and condemnation, the old necessity of faith and regeneration, the old Lutheran conception of salvation as a divine bestowment instead of a human achievement; of the wisdom of God as superior to reason as a source of authority in the chief concerns of life.

It follows from such considerations that every school of theology not only may, but must, and indeed ought to reflect the life of that portion of the Church of Christ to which it is actually and vitally related. This conscious relationship must influence all its work. The prevailing forms of belief and methods of Christian labor which ob-

tain in its constituency will inevitably and constantly affect the manner of its instruction and the direction of its training.

No such school can be indifferent at this point. It should carry in its consciousness a definite and unambiguous relationship to some one great body of Christians. Their prayers support it, their spirit guides it and the pressure of their life helps to give defiteness to various important elements in its life, work and influence.

A church school is no unattached armory for the equipment of scouting parties and free-lances in the church militant.

In this seminary we still believe that the true and real Gospel is not an indefinable something that is to be variously interpreted by every man's theological whimwhams and as something that possesses no powers of consistent endurance and identity from one generation to another.

There is an old and beautiful legend in Spanish lore concerning the convent of St. Benedict which was the home of a holy sisterhood. When the Moors overran Spain they vowed its destruction. But just when they made their assault the convent disappeared, cloisters, cells, chapel and belfry with the inmates suddenly sank underground. Forty years later a lone traveler journeying through the forest at eventide, heard the mysterious echo of vesper bells and voices floating on the still evening air as they breathed forth the praise of even-song. Nothing was seen but the tip of a moss-grown pinnacle with a broken cross on it. Yet the harmonies from that buried convent thrilled the traveler's heart with wonder and awe. Ethereal, mystic, heavenly, they broke upon the ear like unto the echoes of another world. It is even so with the message of salvation, which young men, in this building, are to be trained to bear to other men. When down deep in the heart of man it is the buried power of God there, and as such it is going to keep on ringing for other men and filling their lives with the charm and the cheer and the music of an everlasting redemption. In its wistful and deep need and crying out for God, this world

does need preachers who are to bear to the world a divinely planned and divinely sent salvation.

It is to qualify consecrated young men for this great ambassadorship, that we are here today before God to present to His service this building the erection of which has been made possible by the benefactions of His servants who have loved the Church for which God's Son became incarnate and at last suffered on the cross.

Fathers and brethren, we are at the gateway of a new era for our beloved seminary. Behind us are the years of our fathers; around us is the heritage they have given us; before us the opening years of new service. We regard with gratitude to God the heritage of our Church. We thank Him for the beginning of this school, its past progress and hopeful present. We praise Him for the faith of our fathers, for the truth they guarded and have handed on to us; for the lives they lived and their steadfast and heroic labors. We accept reverently the responsibilities of our time and place, and pray the God of our fathers to make us worthy to enter into their labors and to push forward in our time the school of theology they planted in the days of privation and discouragement.

Gratefully remembering the past, actively embracing the present, trustfully regarding the future may we move forward under God to greater and better things. The fathers who fought the good fight of faith in this region now rest from their toils. They have died in peace and in Christ. May the sons eternally keep that which has been committed to them "against that day" when the quick and the dead shall give an account of their own work and their own labors.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE V.

FULL ASSURANCE OF FAITH.¹

BY PROFESSOR ANDREW G. VOIGT, D.D., LL.D.

Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbia,
S. C.

I lay this down as a thesis: For us there can be no assurance of faith unless we have certainty in regard to the Word of God; and we can have no certainty as to the Word of God unless we have certainty in regard to the Scriptures.

We are living in an age in which there is much discussion of the foundations of faith and the grounds of Christian certainty. I think there are two chief reasons for this. On the one hand, since the time of Schleiermacher the subjective element has predominated in theology; and on the other, the authority and validity of the Scriptures, as an objective basis for assurance, have been unsettled by criticism, which makes it uncertain who is responsible for the narratives of the Bible and the utterances in it, even those ascribed to Christ. The two facts are inwardly connected. The tendency has been to find not only the reality of religion, but also its foundation in internal experience. The consciousness of the Christian is to be not only the seat of his personal religion; but the data on which the certainty of religious experience rests, are also to be found there. Parallel with this subjective tendency and corresponding with it, has been the disposition to attach less importance to the reliability of the historical data in the Scriptures, and the authority of the Bible for Christian faith. Too readily has the Bible been turned over to historical science to make out of it what it can from its point of view by historical criticism. Therefore with increasing uncertainty in regard to the basis for faith given in the Scriptures, there has been the

1. An address delivered at the dedication of the Hamma Divinity School, Nov. 11, 1915.

search in the mind itself for the foundation, on which the heart may ultimately rest in assurance that its religious experience is real and founded in fact.

This subjective tendency has indeed been resisted wherever orthodox theology, nourished by the literature of the 16th and 17th centuries, has prevailed, and the Scriptures have been emphasized as revealing the objective ground of Christian certainty. However, the most orthodox theologian cannot overlook the subjective factor, which necessarily enters into Christian faith; he cannot avoid the question, how does the truth, revealed in the Scriptures, become inwardly the certain possession of the soul by faith? For instance I find that an orthodox Lutheran preacher, Max Frommel, even when holding up Christ as the objective ground of Christian assurance, glides into the declaration of the decisive importance of subjective experience for Christian certainty. He said: "There is no higher proof for the truth than the truth itself; there is no higher proof for Christ than Christ himself; there is no higher proof for the Bible than the Bible itself." But then he continues: "You may assist a seeking soul with all kinds of arguments, but finally this is what stands: 'What ye hear and see.' When one knows how blind he is, and it begins to dawn, and ray upon ray from the whole appearance and person of Christ falls into the dreary dark heart, then he experiences in deed and truth that this is indeed He that should come. This is the proof of experience, to which Christ and His disciples invite men with the appeal: 'Come and see!'" It is from the ground of this inevitable subjective factor in Christian faith that Frank of Erlangen argued so effectively for the necessity of subjectivity in theology.

But whatever recognition may be properly given to the personal experience of faith and to Christian consciousness in the examination of Christian certainty, there is need at the present time to strengthen our hold on the Bible, as the means through which the objective side of Christian certainty is established. To contribute in a

small way to this effort is the special purpose of these remarks.

In recent discussions on Christian certainty in Germany a distinction has been drawn between certainty of salvation and certainty of truth: *Heilsgewissheit* and *Wahrheitsgewissheit*. We refer to it in order to emphasize the truth that there can be no certainty of salvation without certainty of truth. Ihmels, whose notable book has the title, "The Certainty of Christian Truth," expresses the distinction in this way: "When the question of the ground of our certainty of salvation is raised, then the thing to be made out is: upon what does our fellowship with God ultimately rest. On the other hand, whether such fellowship with God exists at all, and whether the facts on which we base the certainty of it are really facts and not mere pious imaginations,—this is not in question, but is assumed as decided. But these are the very questions, with which the certainty of truth has to do." The distinction is sharply drawn, and yet it is a very thin line of difference. After all, when we inquire into the ground of our certainty of salvation and seek to determine upon what our fellowship with God ultimately rests, we want to know whether we have facts under our feet or only pious imaginations. Those questions which Ihmels says are assumed as decided in the problem of the certainty of salvation, cannot be so assumed. The answers to these questions must at least find verification in the inward certainty of salvation. The facts upon which the certainty rests must commend themselves to us in our experience as facts. I can have no inward assurance of the application of the great redemptive facts of Christianity to me, unless the truth and reality of those facts are assured to me. *Heilsgewissheit* is not only inseparable from *Wahrheitsgewissheit*, but it is *Wahrheitsgewissheit*. For certainty of salvation and certainty of truth we need to be sure of the Bible.

In explaining the ground of Christian certainty, 17th century theology emphasized the objective factor, the Word of God in the Scriptures. The inward certainty of that Word they explained by the witness of the Holy

Spirit, also an objective factor. The Supernaturalism of the 18th century stressed the arguments for the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the Bible as guaranteeing the foundation of faith,—also an objective factor. But recent thought has turned to the subjective side of faith and has sought to establish Christian certainty from that side. It has been endeavoring to explain, what it is in the subjective experience of the Christian that is the ground of personal assurance. It is not surprising that the answers are different. The experiences are not the same. Not only is the experience of a Lutheran different from that of a Methodist, but the experience of a Ritschlian Lutheran is different from that of an Erlangen Lutheran. The truth is that certainty is not to be explained from inward experience alone nor even chiefly. Whatever the variations in the answers to the question raised, as to the subjective ground of assurance, they all run out into this general idea: Contact with Christ awakens the sense of man's religious need and satisfies it; in this satisfaction the believer has peace and assurance. It is like the lines in the familiar Christian song: "I love to tell the story, because I know 'tis true; it satisfies my longing as nothing else can do." Ihmels expresses it in these words: "Finally all Christian certainty depends upon this, that the divine revelation, which presses in on the Christian, certifies itself as the absolute satisfaction of his natural religious need." We accept the position as correct as far as it goes. But we shall not now enter into a discussion of the varying conception of the satisfaction afforded, and of the divine revelation involved, and of the concomitant inward experiences. We do not believe that the vital differences are rooted in subjective experience, but rather in the conception of the objective factors which condition and effect it. What is your conception of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the Word of God, of the Bible? There, to our way of thinking, lie the vital differences that affect Christian certainty. Without certainty in regard to these objective factors there can be no full assurance of faith. What degree of certainty in regard to these does inward experience give? What guar-

antee of the objective factors of salvation is there in the inward experience of it? What assurance of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the Word of God, of the forgiveness of sins, can be derived from the realization of a new fellowship with God in the heart? It is easy to put a good deal more upon the evidence from Christian experience than it will legitimately bear. Convictions of truth are sometimes assigned to a foundation of subjective experience which are really obtained from outward testimony, Bible testimony. Certainly from an inward spiritual experience we can know something about the external powers that produce it. The character of what is working upon us manifests itself in the quality of the effect produced in us. A spiritual experience guarantees that the powers that are operating in us are spiritual. But it is precarious to argue from the quality of an inward experience to specific truths about God and to specific facts of His work of salvation. When these truths about God and His work of grace are otherwise learned, then it is possible in the satisfaction of our religious needs, inwardly felt, to be assured that these factors and no others have produced in us spiritual effects. But it is not possible, as has been sometimes attempted, to make Christian certainty independent of apostolic testimony and the Holy Scriptures. An instructive example of the overstraining of the evidence of Christian experience is found in Frank's great work on the subject, although in justice to him be it said that his aim was to show the foundation of the assurance of the truth, which is contained in the Scriptures. His argument is a very acute analysis of the Christian consciousness; and it is a magnificent piece of subtle reasoning by which he endeavors to pass from the subjective fact of regeneration to the reality of the objective factors necessary to account for all the contents of the subjective fact. We are surprised in following him, to find ourselves carried from the new Ego, which the Christian knows himself to be, to the facts of sin, righteousness, the personality of God, the trinity, the divine human Mediator, the Church, the means of grace, the Scriptures, inspiration, miracles, and

the Christian hope. But we feel that Seeberg, who is certainly not unfriendly to Frank, did not misrepresent the fact, when he wrote: "In the end, according to him, almost the entire Lutheran dogmatic in detail is embraced, feature for feature, in the immediate experience of certainty. This surely overshoots the mark." Ultimately all this argumentation of Frank goes back to that paradoxical position of v. Hofmann: "I myself, the Christian am the subject of my theology." Where Frank has failed, nobody else has succeeded, nor is anybody likely to succeed. There is no passable road from our inward experience to certain knowledge of the objective factors at work in producing that experience. This knowledge must come in some other way. We found our own thought admirably expressed in a sentence of old Richard Baxter's: "Even of the mysteries of the Gospel I must needs say, with Mr. Richard Hooker, that, whatever men may pretend, the subjective certainty cannot go beyond the objective evidence; for it is caused thereby as the print on the wax is caused by that on the seal."

How is the knowledge of the objective factors, which enter into Christian faith, to be obtained? This question includes another. What are these factors? It is impracticable to enumerate them in a list. The nature of them can be judged from the central factor in Christian faith. Christian faith is faith in Christ. It arises because Christ has come into the life of a man. He is the central objective factor in salvation and assurance of it. Christ is not an idea, a precipitate of the syncretism of the religious ideas floating in the world in the first Christian century (as some would have us believe), so that the existence of Jesus may be called into question, or if he did exist, he was something different from the Christ of Christian faith. Christ is a factor, historically revealed, and not to be known apart from the historical revelation of His person. Jesus is the Christ. This fact alone indicates that the knowledge of this objective factor of Christian faith can only come by the word which tells of Him. Christ is a comprehensive, complex fact, embracing in His person many single facts, which belong to His

historical existence, such as His birth, His deeds, His death, His resurrection, His ascension. The fact of Christ is more than the "historical Christ" of Ritschlian theology, with his incomparable God-consciousness and moral fidelity to his calling, by which he even now overwhelms men and inspires men to trust in God and to moral activity. Christ is a historical fact related to many other facts as its necessary concomitants, notably the facts connected with the revelation of God before His coming into the world; related also to the testimony of the apostles concerning Him, by which alone we know of His historical manifestation; related also to the doctrine, which He Himself brought into the world; a fact related also to the Church and the exhibition of the power of His person in its ministrations; a fact related also to the transcendent realities, God and His Spirit; Himself a transcendent fact, a transcendent reality as well as a historical fact. The fact of Christ must not be abridged; otherwise the objective factors, which produce the effects in the soul that result in Christian certainty, will be obscured and distorted.

How then is the knowledge of Christ, how is the knowledge of the objective factors, by which Christian faith and its assurance are produced, obtained? Certainly this knowledge cannot be evolved from the inner consciousness. It is presented to the mind of the one who becomes a believer, in a word and testimony. That is to say, the knowledge of the causalities, which bring a man into the state and blessedness of fellowship with God, can only be known through the Holy Scriptures. In order that there may be Christian certainty, there must be some knowledge, outwardly obtained, of the objective factors that are operative in the making of a Christian. The knowledge may be imperfect, but without some assurance of intellectual apprehension, logically preceding, there can be no faith and no assurance. Let a Ritschlian or whoever will, call this intellectualism. Such intellectualism is necessary to Christian certainty, and they, who think they have arrived at certainty of faith without intellectual knowledge of the facts involved, are simply for-

getting or ignoring how the truth of Christ got into their minds and hearts. Before there can be any "fiducia," there must be some "assensus," and this again implies some "notitia." Christian faith is Scriptural faith; not in the sense that the believer first accepts with assurance the Bible as a book divinely authenticated, and then what it declares. (That is the Roman Catholic idea). But in the sense that the believer apprehends God, revealed in Christ, as He is made known, or rather let us say, as He makes Himself known in the Bible.

When the ground of Christian certainty is sought wholly or chiefly in an inward experience, without due regard for the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, the Christ who is believed, will be formed to correspond with the supposed inward experience, instead of the inward faith and life being moulded by the real Christ. The danger of thus changing the real Christianity into another Christianity which is not of Christ, is not imaginary. Liberal theology furnishes instances enough. When we perceive the objective causality and power of Christian experience reduced to what is called the "spirit of Christ," that vague echo of the religious life of Jesus; or when we find it attenuated to the Ritschlian "historical Christ," that luminous shadow of the moral personality of Jesus thrown across the centuries of history, then all the fervor of subjective feeling or conviction will not avail as evidence of a life hid in God with Christ, because the real basis for such a life in history is withdrawn. Nor is the danger of losing hold of the real Christ of revelation by one-sided subjectivism limited to liberal circles. We have the testimony of Ihmels in regard to the more orthodox circles in Germany. He says: "Even the present so-called orthodox (kirchliche) theology to a wide extent is undoubtedly inclined to fail to recognize the importance, which the assurance of the Holy Scriptures has for the individual Christian life of faith. It also is under the influence of the famous paragraph of Schliermacher: 'The authority of the Holy Scriptures cannot be the foundation of faith in Christ; on the contrary this faith must be presupposed in order to ascribe a special authority to the

Holy Scriptures.' ” It is the special merit of the able book of Ihmels on “The Christian Certainty of Truth” that in it he tries to build a bridge from subjective certainty of salvation to assurance of the Holy Scriptures, even of the canon. The argument is not satisfactory, in that he tries to find the grounds of certainty in regard to the Bible, directly or indirectly, in subjective experience. But he emphasizes the vital importance, not only of the contents of the Scriptures, but also of the Scriptures as a revelation of God, for the certitude of Christian faith. This must be duly appreciated. But the ground of Christian certainty cannot be explained from the inner side of Christian faith alone. The authority of the Bible must stand on firmer ground than its subjective authentication to the believer in his experience of faith. The antithesis of Schliermacher, just quoted from Ihmels, is false. It is not true that faith in Christ must be presupposed in order to ascribe a special authority to the Holy Scriptures; nor is it true that the authority of the Holy Scriptures is made the foundation of faith in Christ. “What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.” Christ and the testimony of Scripture that presents Him are embraced in a single act of faith. Our faith in Christ is faith in the testimony of Scripture concerning Him.

The theology of Ritschl is symptomatic of the drift of present religious thought. As is well-known, that theology has tried to make Christian assurance independent of whatever criticism may make of the Scriptures. That is almost equal to making it independent of any historical certainty of the Scriptures. The tendency of the times is to ground assurance upon something apart from the objective testimony of the Bible. This is an impossible undertaking, and it can only lead to undermining Christian faith. For this reason the arguments of Ed. Koenig, although somewhat one-sided, are timely and deserving of attention. After the manner of the old Supernaturalists Koenig contends that faith in Christianity is inseparable from belief in the accredited and authentic witnesses of it, who speak in the Bible. Surely, when once we can no longer believe that Matthew, John and Paul, and the

others had a divine right to tell us what Christ was and what He is to be taken for; when we can no longer believe that Moses, Isaiah and the rest had a divine right to tell us what God is and what He demands and promises, there will be no ground to stand on for Christian certainty. We believe God made Christianity, and in the making is also included the making of the writings which are united in the Book, which is one in truth, and unique, because divine in power.

Christianity is not, like deistic natural religion, a religion of mere ideas. It is a historical religion. Assurance of fellowship with God in it is bound up with certainty of the Bible as a revelation of God. Modern criticism makes it difficult to maintain such certainty. But whatever the difficulties, the position must be maintained. If there is no historical certainty about the facts, in which the revelation of God was made, there can be no certainty of Christian truth, and without certainty of Christian truth there can be no certainty of salvation.

It is gratifying to me that I am now speaking where the reliability of the Bible is unquestioned. It is a reason for special congratulations on this auspicious occasion that the Seminaries of the Lutheran Church in this country are laboring to maintain faith in the Holy Scriptures, in order that there may be preserved in our Church a well-grounded full assurance of faith in God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Columbia, S. C.

ARTICLE VI.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN WITTENBERG COLLEGE.¹

BY REV. PROFESSOR B. F. PRINCE, PH.D.

Senior Professor and Vice President of Wittenberg College.

We have reached another gratifying point in the history of theological education in Wittenberg College. There is enough success in its development to make us anxious to trace its early history and struggles for an existence among the institutions of the land. It has had a long and interesting career, doing its work quietly but showing fruits at all times worthy the efforts of its founders, and teachers. It is perhaps, not useless at this time of rejoicing and congratulations to go over once more the steps that led to the establishment of a college and seminary under the control of the Lutheran Church in the West. It is well to keep in mind the work of the pioneers, who, under many privations, endured hardships, yet labored with great earnestness in building houses of worship, gathering congregations, instructing the young and striving to perpetuate the faith of their fathers. Their names and work should never be forgotten amid the splendid advances and attainments of a later day. This can be properly done by referring to them and their achievements on such occasions as this, giving them a place in the thoughts and memory of those who love to recall and consider the men who were forceful enough to set in motion some great cause or interest useful to mankind.

Scarcely had the State of Ohio been formed and received into the Union when a crowd of adventurers flocked into its bounds and located themselves in places that seemed attractive to them. Among the numbers who

¹ A paper read at the dedication of Hamma Divinity School Nov. 10-11, 1915.

came were Lutherans from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. They settled in certain counties, entered lands, and made homes for themselves by cutting down the forests and preparing fields from which their future subsistence was to be obtained. In the midst of all their toil and struggles for the necessities of life, they did not forget the lessons that were taught them back in the little churches in which they with their parents, relatives and friends worshiped Almighty God.

Scarcely had their labors amid forest scenes begun when the faithful minister arrived to hunt up the scattered people and remind them that the claims of religion were as strong and necessary in their new surroundings and conditions as they had been back in the home which they had left. As early as 1805 the Lutheran minister came seeking the scattered members of the flock for the purpose of organizing them again for religious service which had, unfortunately, for a time been disturbed and neglected.

These early preachers came at great sacrifice of comfort, for the hardships of a pastor's life in the new State, in many places threaded only by paths through dense forests and over bridgeless streams, were in strong contrast with the pastorates they had left beyond the mountains. There came Simon, Foster, Stauch, Steck, Henkle, Scherer, Leist, Geyer, Dill and others, some to cast in their life with the pioneers and some to view the field for a brief day and then return to their former homes. Those were brave, pious, and earnest men who put their hands to the plow and kept at the work until they had planted the seed and produced a harvest meet for their labors. These first ministers organized churches in many places and kept the work going until others arrived and relieved them of some of their labors and pushed still further the interests of the Church and people wherever opportunity seemed favorable.

The influx of a Lutheran population was greater than could be cared for by the existing ministry on the field. Whence a sufficient supply should come was ever a perplexing question. Most of those who came on the field were

either from Germany or persons trained under the guidance of some learned pastor of the East. But the supply was not large enough. Beside these, were young men on the local field desirous of entering the ministry who could not or would not go to the East to receive their preparatory training. They must either place themselves under the tuition of some western pastor whose labors were already too arduous, or abandon the purpose of entering the ministry. After the organization of the German Lutheran Synod in 1818 the subject of preparing young men for the sacred calling was presented at each annual meeting. All felt that something must be done, but means to carry into effect suitable plans were not available. But these discussions were bound in time to bring forth fruit of a proper character. The idea of a theological school for the training of young men for the ministerial office took form and was carried into definite action. A seminary was opened at Canton, Ohio, in 1830. Two years later it was transferred to Columbus, where it still exists and is known as Capitol University.

Many of the Lutherans coming from the Eastern States were already using the English instead of the German language, while others scattering themselves among the English speaking inhabitants of Ohio soon became familiar with the English tongue and preferred it to the German in public worship. To satisfy such persons Lutheran pastors who could use the English as well as the German were sought. By the fourth decade of the century, the German Lutheran Synod which in 1833 became the Joint Synod of Ohio, contained a considerable number of such pastors. In 1836, the English pastors withdrew from the Joint Synod and formed one of their own, named the "English Lutheran Synod of the State of Ohio." It remained for four years a branch of the Joint Synod, and its congregations continued to contribute liberally to the support of the German Theological Seminary at Columbus.

In 1840, for various reasons, the English Synod withdrew its connection with the Joint Synod, expecting, however, to have a share in the directorate of the Columbus

institution. The latter Synod at once denied them all rights and privileges in the management and use of said institution. At the meeting of the English Synod in 1841 a delegate from the Evangelical Synod of the West was present with a proposition that the two Synods unite in founding a theological and literary institution within the bounds of the Synod of the West. The proposition was not accepted for two reasons: First, the English Synod did not wish to patronize an institution located so far beyond its boundaries, and, second, they still had hopes that they might be allowed representation in the Board of Directors of the institution at Columbus. In another year this hope was entirely abandoned for no door was opened for their admission.

One is sometimes led to wonder what would have been the outcome if the Joint Synod had acceded to the request of the English Synod. It might have held together the Lutherans of Ohio, at least for a considerable time. It would have resulted in presenting to the public a stronger church organization and one on account of its numbers commanding greater respect and appreciation from the community. It is likely, however, that division would have come later over discussions and disagreements concerning doctrines and forms. The Anglicised Lutherans were to some extent in their more practical methods swinging away from views thought essential by the German ministers. This tendency probably could not have been modified or stayed under any conditions in those days.

At the meeting of the English synod in 1842 all hope of securing what they believed to be their just right having failed, it was thought necessary to take steps by which their own future welfare could be secured. In his report the President of the Synod called the attention of that body to the importance of establishing a theological and literary institution. This subject became a matter for profound consideration, and after long and earnest deliberation the few, but ardent advocates, pastors and laymen, resolved to found an institution in behalf of the interests of the Church which they represented. The reso-

lution they passed reads as follows: "Resolved, That in reliance upon the Triune Jehovah, and alone for His honor and glory, we now in synod assembled establish a literary and theological institution." It was a solemn moment to all present. It was a noted act to decide a question so vital to the future development of Lutheranism in Ohio and adjacent States. A constitution for the new institution was adopted and a Board of Directors consisting of six pastors and six laymen was appointed. A subscription paper was passed and fifteen hundred dollars were pledged for the work. None of the men who were appointed to take the preliminary steps were noted for unusual scholarship in any line, but were men of practical views, and who realized the necessity of increasing the number of ministers from the young men that were to be found in the Church in this western field.

Where to locate the institution was an important question. Two places made bids for it, Canton and Wooster. The latter place made the better offer and was awarded the institution. Another important matter was that of a professor in theology. There was no discussion at that time about a president. The office of president must wait for a later time. The minds of the men of that day were more concerned about the subject of theology than about literary and scientific subjects.

There was at once a general feeling that Rev. Ezra Keller was the man for the place. Some years before he had served as a missionary in the West for the Old Pennsylvania Ministerium and in that capacity he visited many churches in Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Illinois. He was known for his zeal, ability as a preacher, for his practical sense, and as a good theologian. He had expressed great hopes for the West, and had impressed men who met him as just the man for the proposed institution. He was offered the position, and after some deliberation he accepted the call, not as president of the new institution, but as Professor of Theology. Yet he became the chief factor in the new movement.

The school was opened at Wooster in June 1844. Seventeen young men entered the classical and four the

theological school. The names of those who began the study of theology at Wooster were, David Earhart, Isaac Culler, David Harbaugh, and Adam Helwig. When a year later the institution was moved to Springfield two of these young men, Harbaugh and Helwig, also came and continued their studies. Long and useful lives were meted out to Harbaugh and Earhart in service to the Church. Culler and Helwig were also faithful preachers of the Word in Ohio. There was such need for ministers in those days that the English Synod of Ohio at its meeting at Wooster, in the fall of 1844, licensed D. Earhart and M. Culler to preach the Gospel, hence they did not continue their studies in the institution.

After the removal of the institution to Springfield, on account of the many administrative and financial duties required, it was discovered by the Board of Directors that a president was a necessity. There were no means at hand to support such an officer, and so they were compelled to place the burden of the presidency on Rev. Keller, in addition to his duties as Professor of Theology. It was demanding too much of one man to look after details, secure money by solicitation for a new building, and at the same time have entire charge of instruction in the subjects demanded in theological education. Perhaps these onerous duties, together with the care of the congregation just reorganized in Springfield laid upon the first theological professor, so reduced his strength of body that he fell an easy prey to the fever that carried him to an early grave.

In the first catalogue of the College and Seminary including the two years, 1845-7, thirteen students are enrolled in theology. They were young men of limited preparatory education which made the work of instruction more difficult for the professor. A number of the thirteen remained for three years in pursuit of their studies. In 1847-8 two classes are listed with sixteen students enrolled.

To relieve Dr. Keller to some extent of his arduous duties, in 1847 Rev. T. Storke was elected to give part of his time in the College and part in the Seminary. He

considered the call for some time but finally declined the offered position. The Board of Directors then elected Rev. J. G. Harris to the same position who held it for several years. After his resignation, Rev. F. W. Conrad served the institution for nearly five years, giving most of his time to instruction in the Seminary. After his resignation the Seminary had but one teacher until 1865.

In December 1848 in the midst of his usefulness, Dr. Ezra Keller was stricken down almost without a moment's notice. His death produced profound sorrow not only among the students but in the city of Springfield. In his nearly five years of association in the community he had made an impression that remained until the last one who remembered him and his work had passed away. The Board at once sought some one to take his place and was fortunate in securing the services of Rev. Samuel Sprecher of Chambersburg, Pa. In June 1849, he came and assumed all the duties laid down by the former president of the institution and professor of theology. It was to him an untried field of labor and practical duties, and his first year of service was closely scrutinized by those who had known and admired Dr. Keller for his ability, devotion, and practical sense displayed in the management of affairs about the institution. It was soon found that the Board had made no mistake in their selection. Dr. Sprecher proved himself a great teacher and left an impress on his students, in College and Seminary, that will still be felt after those who sat under his instruction have passed away. His was a master mind that lived in regions of broad expanse of thought and Christian philosophy, and which he opened to the delight of those who sat at his feet as learners.

In 1865 Rev. Joel Swartz, of Baltimore, Md., was elected as an additional professor in the Seminary. After two years he resigned, having found the work of the pastorate more to his taste than that of a professorship. In character and companionship no person could be more agreeable than he. Those who knew him well regretted his early withdrawal.

With the exception of the two years of service given by

Dr. Swartz, Dr. Sprecher was the sole Professor of Theology from 1855 to 1873. With all his duties of teaching in College and Seminary, together with general administration of affairs, it was impossible for him to keep his students in theology longer than one year. He often expressed regret over it and longed for a better day. It was the best he could do, and only when he protested against working under these conditions any longer did the Board of Directors wake up to a realizing sense of the need of additional teaching force, both in the College and Seminary. The effort to supply this need was at once made and its fulfillment in 1873 began a better day for theological training in Wittenberg.

It would not only be ungenerous but also untrue to say that the outcome of the work so much limited for reasons already named, produced no good and lasting fruits. A host of able preachers and successful pastors trained under these conditions served well their day and generation. Many of them became fine scholars and theologians and would have adorned the pulpits of any denomination in our land. They received enough inspiration as well as instruction from their preceptor to lead them to faithful study and self-application on account of which they became known throughout the Church and the land as leaders in thought and in the practical work of the ministry. It is the spirit that an instructor awakens in the student that counts for most in his life, and if he follows out its promptings he will not fail to attain an honorable place among his fellows.

Such was the influence of Keller and Sprecher. They wrought under conditions that were all too heavy for any man, but their work was not in vain. In this day of prosperity for this Divinity School, made so by the noble generosity of two men who were products of the period heretofore described, the labors, endurance and faithful services of Keller and Sprecher will not be forgotten.

The turning point and advancement of this school has its date in 1873. A second professor was at that time added in the person of Dr. J.H.W. Stuckenberg, and at his resignation Dr. S. A. Ort came. Later a third, a fourth,

a fifth professor has been added. Equipments have come along with the years in buildings and other facilities in consequence of the generous benefactions of Rev. Charles Stroud and Dr. M. W. Hamma. How almost in vision, this line of progress and success was seen by Dr. Keller when he walked over these grounds, fell on his knees, and prayed for the direction of Almighty God and for the future of this institution planted here. He had faith that it would grow into a mighty agency for the betterment and salvation of men.

Representing the older alumni of the Seminary it is not in my province to dwell long on the better days that have so signally come to the younger generations of students. Those yet living of the earlier alumni rejoice in the new conditions that give such advantages to the young men of to-day. With increased number of teachers, with a full course of three years of study, with buildings used exclusively for the theological school, and with the advantages of a growing reference library which we did not have in our day, we are led to join heartily in this season of rejoicing over the great and useful changes and advantages that now characterize our Hamma Divinity School. We are specially glad also in the fact that one of the older alumni, known and loved by us all, Rev. Dr. M. W. Hamma, did so much by his splendid gifts to make this day a possibility. On our part it would be vain to regret our lack of other days, but rather would we older alumni turn our faces to the advances and improvements now made and join fully with mind and heart in the pleasures that prevail on this happy occasion.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO THE FOUNDING OF WITTENBERG COLLEGE AND SEMINARY IN 1845.¹

BY REV. FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D.D.

There was a period of 103 years between the landing of the Patriarch Muhlenberg in 1742 and the founding of Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845, seventy years ago. It is for the purpose of portraying the efforts made during this period in behalf of theological education in our Church in this country that this paper is attempted. The real problem of a native ministry did not develop acutely until toward the close of the eighteenth century, since the supply of ministers from Sweden did not cease until 1771, and the supply from Halle not until 1783. It is not claimed that during the period preceding there was no need for native candidates, for we know that piteous cries went across to the fatherlands for pastors. Neither would it be intimated that there were no efforts made by the learned Halle pastors during this earlier period, not only to instruct candidates, but also to establish a theological institution. "The Patriarch Muhlenberg had not been in this country ten years before he proposed duplicating, in minature at least, the Orphan Home at Halle, with a theological department annexed. The

1 In the preparation of this paper, which was presented as an address at the dedication services of Hamma Divinity Hall, of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, November 10, 1915, the author was under great obligations to the following sources of information: "The Documentary History of The Ministerium of Pennsylvania"; Vol. XIII "Lutheran Church Review," Article by Dr. B. Sadtler; "Evangelical Review," Vol. XV, Article by Prof. M. L. Stoever; "Evangelical Review," Vol. X, Article by Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg; "Hartwick Seminary Memorial Volume, 1865; Historical Address," Prof. James Pitcher, D.D., 1897; "History of the American Lutheran Church, 1846," Rev. E. L. Hazelius, D.D., Dr. Schodde's "History of the Lutheran Seminary at Columbus, Ohio"; and Anstadt's "Life of Dr. S. S. Schmucker."

general poverty of the churches and the people compelled him to abandon the project." Already in 1769 reference is made in the minutes of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to "a seminary which is to be established." In 1773 Dr. John Christopher Kunze, who had arrived only three years earlier, and who was perhaps the most scholarly of all the Halle ministers, proposed to the Ministerium a plan and constitution for a German seminary in Philadelphia. At this convention Mr. Frederick Rohl was elected procurator. Dr. Kunze was especially distinguished as a Hebraist and theologian. He was professor of Oriental Languages and Literature in the University of Pennsylvania, which was founded early in his fourteen years as assistant pastor to Dr. Helmuth in Philadelphia. Dr. Kunze's plan contemplated an affiliation between the work of the theological seminary and the classical department of the University of Pennsylvania. But his fond expectations ended in disappointment owing largely to the Revolutionary War. In 1785 he removed to a pastorate in New York City. Here he renewed his individual efforts and here he was again professor of Oriental Languages and Literature, this time in Columbia College. He usually had students with him in their preparation for the ministry, his instructions often being conveyed in the Latin language. This method he continued until 1797, when he began the work of the Hartwick Foundation. His successor in Philadelphia was Dr. J. F. Schmidt, a devoted friend of the senior pastor, Dr. J. H. C. Helmuth. For twenty years these two learned men continued a sort of private theological seminary and sent out some of the ablest ministers of our Church. The students of Kunze, Schmidt and Helmuth, were thoroughly evangelical, and preserved the Church to a very large extent from the strong rationalistic influences then prevalent.

Among the students of Patriarch Muhlenberg were Ludwig Schrenk in 1749; John Nicholas Kurtz, who was ordained at the first meeting of the Ministerium in 1748; John H. Schaum, Jacob Van Buskirk and Lucas Raus. A decade later the influential Swedish pastor, Provost

Wrangel, was associated with Muhlenberg and was the instructor of Christian Streit, and Muhlenberg's son, John Peter Gabriel, later the distinguished soldier. Christian Streit labored in the Southern Church and, in turn, instructed candidates there. Among Dr. Kunze's most distinguished students were Dr. Philip F. Mayer, later pastor of the First English Lutheran Church in this country, St. John's of Philadelphia, and Dr. Henry A. Muhlenberg, of Reading, later United States Minister to Austria. Among the distinguished students of Pastors Helmuth and Schmidt were Drs. George Lochman, John G. Schmucker, Frederick Heyer, Christian Endress, Jacob Goering, J. G. Butler, John Michael Steck, and others. Dr. Henry Ernst Muhlenberg, of Lancaster, also instructed candidates, among whom were Dr. J. Daniel Kurtz, John Andrew Schulze, later governor of Pennsylvania, and Benjamin Keller. Rev. Jacob Goering, the first native Lutheran minister from west of the Susquehanna, and pastor at York, was one of the most active instructors during his ministry from 1774 to 1807. Among his students were Dr. Frederick David Schaeffer and John Ruthrauff. The record shows that he had twenty-two private students. In turn Frederick David Schaeffer educated his four sons, David F., of Frederick; Frederick Solomon, of Hagerstown; Frederick Christian, of New York; and Charles F., who later had the distinction of teaching in three seminaries, Columbus, Gettysburg and Philadelphia. Christian Endress instructed A. G. Deininger, Jacob Albert and probably others. William Carpenter was the tutor of George D. Flohr and others in the Southern Church, as was John F. Bergman in the Georgia Church. About the same time Rev. Jacob A. Krug, of Frederick, was the instructor of Paul Henkel. Another able and notable instructor was Dr. Geissenhainer, of New Hanover, from 1793 to 1838. Dr. John G. Schmucker, in York, subsequent to 1792, instructed his son, Samuel S. Schmucker, Daniel Gottwald, Reuben Weiser, Michael Eyster, J. H. Herbst and Charles A. Morris. Dr. George Lochman, 1794 to 1826, tutored his son Dr. Augustus H. Lochman, Dr. Benjamin Kurtz, George

Reimensnyder, Emanuel Keller, Jonathan and Frederick Ruthrauff, J. P. Shindle, and others. In New York State Drs. F. H. Quitman and A. Wackerhagen were the instructors of Dr. John Bachman, later the great leader in the Southern Church, Jacob Berger and others. Subsequent to 1808 Dr. David F. Schaeffer, in Frederick, instructed Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sr., Dr. D. J. Hauer, Dr. E. Greenwald, later a pioneer in the work in Ohio, D. P. Rosenmiller, another Ohio pioneer, Benjamin Keller, F. J. Ruth, M. Wachter, and others. At New Market, Virginia, the young pastor, Samuel S. Schmucker, had among his private students John G. Morris, John Reck, and others, most of whom completed their course under him at Gettysburg after 1826. In Easton, Pa., a prominent instructor was Rev. John P. Hecht. In Virginia the Henkel family conducted a sort of family theological seminary through several generations. Paul Henkel, the first instructor of Dr. John G. Schmucker, instructed his five sons: David, Ambrose, Philip, Charles and Andrew. David in turn was tutor to his sons, Drs. Polycarp and Socrates. Among others representative of this period and method, and without reference to chronological order, should be mentioned Dr. Charles R. Demme, instructor of Dr. G. F. Krotel; Charles A. G. Storch, tutor to Gottlieb Schober; Dr. E. L. Hazelius, tutor of Dr. George B. Miller while pastor at New Germantown, N. J.; Dr. John Bachman, tutor to Professor John G. Schwartz, first professor of the seminary in South Carolina; Dr. F. C. Schaeffer taught John P. Goertner; F. N. Melsheimer, Abraham Reck, the pioneer at Cincinnati; John Michael Steck, Johan Mechling; Jacob Scherer, his brother Daniel, an Illinois pioneer; Jno. P. Shindle, Jacob Martin; Peter W. Domeier, Dr. Geo. N. Lintner and Jacob Leist, D. Schuh. Several of these names will be recognized as pioneers in Ohio who had part in the founding of Wittenberg. Of the labors of these men Dr. B. Sadtler well says: "They kept our churches and ministry at least evangelical in doctrine and whatever of confessional fidelity survived, resided in them. And noble was the band they reared

to take up the work that was bowing down their weary frames and fainting souls.”—*Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. 13, p. 167.

In some years the Ministerium designated certain pastors as official preceptors (1804).

As to the qualifications of these early theological preceptors, especially those who came from Halle, there can be no question. They were “men of enlarged intellectual culture, their minds were thoroughly disciplined and filled with appropriate knowledge. They had been subjected to the most rigid systematic training through years of patient, toilsome, laborious effort, and they had satisfactorily sustained the various processes of careful examination,” so writes Professor M. L. Stoever, “the Plutarch of the American Lutheran Church.” It is to be expected, therefore, that their requirements of their candidates would be rigid and scholarly. Indeed the constitutions of the Ministerium of both 1781 and 1792 carefully safeguarded the qualifications of the ministry. As to the material which they found in their theological candidates there was doubtless a great variety, fully as great probably as a modern theological seminary finds in its classrooms. It was even so in the time of Luther, for in comparing representative men of his day, did he not say: “Melancthon has both style and matter; Luther, matter without style; Erasmus, style without matter; Carlstadt neither the one nor the other.” It will be of interest to introduce at this point a record of examinations which took place, the first in 1760 and the second in 1784:

“One of these examinations was that of Mr. William Kurtz, which took place before the Swedish and Lutheran ministers, assembled in Synodical session at Providence, October, 1760; the other, that of Mr. Daniel Kurtz, at a meeting of the Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, held at Lancaster in 1784. Muhlenberg thus writes in reference to the former of these: “In the afternoon at three o’clock, the Rev. Ministerium commenced the examination of Mr. William Kurtz, as several congregations in Heidelberg had earnestly requested he might become their pastor. After prayer, he was re-

quested to open the Greek Testament, at the third chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and explain it in Latin, which he did satisfactorily, without hesitation. Afterwards, two Psalms were given him in Hebrew, to be translated at once literally into Latin, which was done with equal readiness and fluency. Provost Wrangel was very much pleased, and said that he had not expected this in the American wilderness, and thereupon began to question the candidate in Latin upon some articles of the Creed; thus the examination was continued on the different branches of theology, and he received the unanimous testimony of the members, that he had given satisfactory evidence of his qualifications. It was resolved, to ordain him at the next Ministerial session, D.V., on which occasion he was to give his answers to the written questions proposed to him." Pastor Helmuth furnishes us with the account of the examination of the other Mr. Kurtz, in his diary. "The candidate, Mr. Daniel Kurtz, a son of the aged Mr. Kurtz in York, was recommended for licensure. He had received instruction, for nearly three years, in the languages, theology and the sciences; and his instructor, Pastor Muhlenberg the younger, at Lancaster, gave him an excellent recommendation, both as regards diligence and upright deportment, and requested his examination. Pastor Voigt made a commencement with Hebrew, Greek, &c., Dr. Kunze also in Greek. The assembled clergy testified their satisfaction, and gave him the following questions to answer in writing:

1. How is it shown that Christ was not only a teacher of men, but also truly rendered satisfaction for their sins?
2. What are the operations and benefits of the Holy Spirit?
3. How may a person know that he is converted?
4. How is the validity of infant baptism proved?
5. How is the eternity of future punishment made manifest?
6. Were the apostles infallible in their preaching?"

These two examples are sufficient to show what circum-

spection they used, in the case of candidates for the pastoral office.

We pass now to the period of institutional theological instruction. The plans of Muhlenberg and Kunze for a seminary in Philadelphia did not materialize until the latter part of the nineteenth century. But in 1796, through the death of Rev. John Christopher Hartwick, Dr. Kunze, then in New York City, and Dr. Helmuth, still in Philadelphia were appointed the Literary Directors of a Proposed Institution to be founded from the Hartwick Estate. Dr. Helmuth on account of distance, declined the appointment, so that to Dr. Kunze, at last, fell the opportunity of being the organizer of a Lutheran Theological Seminary in this country. For, under the will of Rev. John Christopher Hartwick, all of his estate, which consisted of lands in Otsego County, New York State, was to be devoted to the establishment of a theological school under the title of "A Gymnasium Evangelicum Ministeriale pro propagatione Evangelicae Christianae religionis inter Gentiles." Rev. John Christopher Hartwick had come to this country soon after Muhlenberg, and was one of the organizers of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1748. He seems to have been more or less eccentric and a good deal of an itinerant of a preacher, his ministrations extending from the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia to New England, where he ministered to the Waldoboro settlement in Maine. However, he was a man of considerable ability, and was always very close to Muhlenberg. He preached the ordination sermon at the first convention of the Ministerium. While he did not plan to put the proposed institution under direct synodical jurisdiction, yet the fact that he made Dr. Frederick A. Muhlenberg, then Speaker of the National Congress, one of his executors, and such leaders as Drs. Kunze and Helmuth as his Literary Directors, shows that he meant to have it managed directly by leaders in our Church at that time. His will was a very curious instrument, and too lengthy to set forth here. It provided, however, that the design of the institution was to be "the training of young men, properly qualified in body

and mind, for the preaching of the gospel to the natives who were not yet Christianized, and provided further that whenever there should be no more needed of missionaries to red or black heathens, or the revenue of his estate would bear it, the compass of instruction might be enlarged to classical learning"; and adds, "but no heathen author shall ever be allowed to be taught in the institution to stain the mind of youth; and as for discipline, he who requires a whip is only fit for the army. The rod is a divine institution, but only for children not come to ripeness of judgment." The schedule of the value of the estate in 1801 was about \$16,000. Under the will, Dr. Kunze at once proceeded to act, and on the fifteenth day of September, 1797, had a meeting of the representatives of the estate and resolved to at once found a theological and missionary seminary, "as so many of the Lutheran Churches were destitute of laborers." They then proceeded to elect a faculty consisting of Dr. Kunze, of York, as theological professor at a salary of \$500; Rev. A. T. Braun, of Albany, as assistant professor at \$250, and Rev. John Frederick Ernst, of Hudson, at \$250. Mr. Ernst was at once to go upon the lands of the testator in Otsego County and there instruct the youth. He thus removed to Cooperstown, where he remained for three or four years, teaching and preaching. This arrangement was maintained until the death of Dr. Kunze in 1807. During this period Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Quitman, of Rhinebeck, was for a time a member of the faculty, and among the ministers prepared under this arrangement were Philip F. Mayer, already referred to; Henry Muhlenberg, John Bachman and many others. Rev. Dr. Philip F. Mayer was graduated in 1803 and was pastor at Athens until 1807 when he took charge of St. John's English Lutheran Church in Philadelphia, where he ministered for over fifty years. It is presumed that Dr. Kunze was succeeded by Rev. Braun. We learn in Dr. Hazelius' *History of the Lutheran Church* (page 131), that Dr. Bachman succeeded Rev. Braun in his pastorate and says "The Rev. John Bachman, a graduate of Union College, was the successor of Rev. Mr. Braun, from whom

he had also received instruction in theology." After the death of Dr. Kunze in 1807, Dr. Knauff, the executor, took steps to definitely locate the Seminary at Hartwick. The Seminary building and professor's house were begun in 1812 and completed in 1815. It is hard to tell how much actual instruction was carried on between 1807 and 1815. But in 1815 Rev. Dr. Ernst Lewis Hazelius was called from New Germantown, N. J., and put in charge as principal and professor of theology. His assistant was John A. Quitman, later governor of Mississippi, and very distinguished as a southern leader and general in the Mexican War. Dr. Hazelius was a most remarkable man, and had the unusual distinction of teaching first in Hartwick Seminary until 1830; second, Professor of German and Biblical and Oriental Literature at Gettysburg from 1830 to 1833, and then professor at Lexington, S. C., from 1833 to the time of his death in 1853. On his father's side he was a descendant of a long line of Lutheran ministers in the Swedish Church. He was born in Neusals, Prussia, Sept. 6, 1777, where his parents had become Moravians. Two interesting incidents in his early life should be recorded: "When five years old his parents took him with them on a visit to Herrnhut. During this visit the aged Polycarp Müller, a bishop of the Moravian Church, took him in his arms and solemnly dedicated him to the work of the ministry. This made an undying impression on the mind of the child, and to his latest years he could repeat every word the old man had said." The other incident is even more striking: Catherine the Second of Prussia, who, as Princess of Anhalt Zerbst, had resided in Stetten, was on terms of great intimacy with her then school-mate, Christiana Brahtz, later the mother of young Hazelius. When the Empress heard of the birth of young Ernst, she wrote to his mother: "Dear Christiana, Give your consent and I will be a mother to your boy." The parents evaded a direct reply, deeming it best to refer the question for final decision to the boy himself after he had reached the proper age. At length, the communication from the imperial palace was so urgent in tone that a prompt reply was required. "The

question was now referred for final decision to young Ernst, who had reached his tenth year; his parents believing that God would direct his choice. From his earliest childhood the lad had given evidence of uncommon piety, and had determined if he lived to become a preacher of the gospel. When, therefore, the Empress wrote for a final answer and the decision was placed in his hands, he did not hesitate promptly *to decline* the flattering offer, for he felt that his was a higher calling, that he was formed to labor as an ambassador of Christ in extending the interests of His kingdom. Often in after years did he allude to this incident and to the kind providence that shaped his decision." "Had I accepted Catherine's offer," he would say, "how different would have been my life—how changed my lot! Perhaps, like many of the former favorites of the Czar's, I might even now be languishing in the mines of Siberia." Hebrews XI: 24, 25, and 26: "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season:—Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; *for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.*" Dr. Hazelius was educated in Moravian institutions in the old country, and in 1880 was called to Nazareth, Pa., as teacher of Greek, Latin and Hebrew. While there he was made head teacher and professor of theology in the theological department. His first three divinity students became bishops in the Moravian Church. Differing, however, from the Moravians in certain views of doctrine and polity, he resolved to sever his connection with the seminary and return to the Church of his fathers. In 1809 he took charge of Lutheran congregations in and near New Germantown, N. J., having been ordained by the New York Ministerium. This was the man, more than any other one man, who was the real founder of Hartwick Seminary. When he left it to go to Gettysburg in 1830 he was succeeded by Dr. George B. Miller, his wife's nephew by marriage, and whom he had instructed in theology at New German-

town. Dr. George B. Miller also had a very distinguished career as a versatile scholar and as professor of theology at Hartwick extending, with only a slight intermission, from 1830 to 1867.

Hartwick Seminary was chartered by the legislature of New York in 1816, the charter providing "That the principal of said seminary shall always be a Lutheran minister of good standing, and that a majority of the trustees shall always be Lutheran clergymen and laymen, whose duty it shall be, in addition to the other branches of education to be taught in the seminary, to teach candidates for the gospel ministry, in the same seminary, a regular system of theology."

We come now to the founding of the first official Synodical Lutheran Seminary in this country. We have traced the movements within the Ministerium of Pennsylvania up to 1800. We find that early in the nineteenth century there was a movement to found a common seminary by the Lutherans and Reformed. Indeed it was originally intended that theology should be taught at Franklin College, founded at Lancaster, Pa., in 1787 by the Lutherans and Reformed. In 1818 a committee from the Reformed Synod was received with this in view. In 1820 a plan for such a common seminary with the Reformed was drafted by young Samuel S. Schmucker, who was licensed by the Ministerium that year. As Samuel S. Schmucker was the providential agent in the founding of the theological seminary at Gettysburg, we may well recall here some of the significant incidents in his preparatory period. Born in 1799, he came to York in his eleventh year having received his elementary training in the common schools in Hagerstown. In York he was further trained in the York County Academy until his fifteenth year. During this period his desire to study for the ministry grew stronger. When thirteen years of age Dr. Helmuth, who had been his father's preceptor about twenty-two years before, in a most kindly letter, written in Latin, urged the young man to come to the University of Pennsylvania. In 1814 he entered the Freshman class in the University and remained there to

the close of the Sophomore year. He was graduated from the University in 1819, although never having completed more than the Sophomore year. While in Philadelphia from 1814 to 1816 he studied theology under Dr. Hel-muth, at that time the most prominent theological in-structor in our Church. He then returned to York and taught in the Academy from 1816 to 1818, and during this period continued his theological studies under his father, who was also among the ablest of our pastors and theologians at that time. As there was no Lutheran theological seminary nearer than Hartwick, which had been started in its new location only in 1815, he went to Princeton Seminary, which had been established in 1812. There he remained from August of 1818, to March of 1820. Before his graduation, in February, 1820, he visited Rev. F. C. Schaeffer, a pastor in New York, and with him made a careful study of the needs of our Church as represented by the conditions to be seen in and about New York at that time. In writing the result of these observations to his father he said: "We promised each other that in reliance on God we would do everything possible to promote the following objects: In general, to labor for the welfare of our Church, that a rule may be established according to which every applicant must be examined in regard to his personal Christianity, that the Augsburg Confession should again be brought up out of the dust, and everyone must subscribe to the twenty-one articles, and declare before God, by his subscription, that it corresponds with the Bible not *quantum*, but *quia*; and we promised to do everything possible to promote learning among us." Of his purposes at this time he later writes: "When I left Princeton, there were three *pia desideria*, which were very near to my heart, for the welfare of our Church: A translation of some one eminent system of Lutheran Dogmatics, a theological seminary, and a college for the Lutheran Church." The first of these he achieved in 1826 when he published a translation of Storr and Flatt's Biblical Theology. The second was fulfilled September 5, 1826, when the Theological Seminary of the General Synod was opened at Gettysburg,

and the third in 1832 when Pennsylvania College was established, three most remarkable achievements within nine years of his ordination, 1823. In the first class were fourteen students, most distinguished among whom were Lewis Eichelberger, David Jacobs, John G. Morris, Jonathan Oswald and David P. Rosenmiller. In the second class names of special interest are Henry L. Baugher, Sr., Daniel Gottwald, Henry D. Keyl, Wm. M. Reynolds. In the eighth class appears the name of Samuel Sprecher, who later became the brother-in-law of Samuel Schmucker, and, still later, the second president of Wittenberg College and Seminary. In the tenth class there entered Ezra Keller, founder of Wittenberg College and first president of this Seminary and David F. Bittle, founder of Roanoke College. Time prevents detailing the many interesting incidents in the years preceding and in the early years of the Seminary at Gettysburg. In general they are familiar to us.

However, the following are worthy of record in this connection: In 1825 the General Synod appointed a committee to prepare a plan for a Seminary. Of this committee S. S. Schmucker was chairman. In his report the first resolution was: "That the General Synod will forthwith commence, in the name of the Triune God, and in humble reliance on His aid, the establishment of a Theological Seminary, which shall be exclusively devoted to the glory of our Divine Redeemer, Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever. And in this Seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession."

In the constitution which he prepared, Article I declared this design: "To provide our churches with pastors who sincerely believe the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as they are fundamentally taught in the Augsburg Confession, and who will teach them in opposition to Deists, Unitarians, Arians, Antinomians and all other fundamental errorists."

Thus was fulfilled the resolve, or vow, of himself and Pastor Schaeffer, made in 1820, less than six years be-

fore, under the rationalistic conditions of our Church at that time, both in New York and in other sections. In the professor's oath, which he had also prepared, he said: "I solemnly declare in the presence of God and of the Directors of this Seminary (his father was their President and D. F. Schaeffer, Secretary) that I do *ex animo* believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God and the only perfect rule of faith and practice. I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God. And I do solemnly promise not to teach anything, either directly or by insinuation, which shall appear to contradict, or in any degree more or less remote, inconsistent with the doctrines and principles avowed in this declaration." Thus was the ecclesiastical position of the Seminary established, and, for that day, a strong confessional basis inaugurated.

Great credit should also be given for the establishment of Gettysburg Seminary to Charles P. Krauth, Sr., and Benjamin Kurtz. Krauth was, later, the first president of Pennsylvania College, and Kurtz, by his two years' trip to Europe, 1826 to 1828, secured \$10,000 in money and 6,000 books for the new Seminary. In 1858 he became the founder of Missionary Institute at Selinsgrove. Reference has already been made to Dr. John Bachman, in New York State. By the providence of God he was to be the leading personality in the founding of a theological institution in the Southern Church. Already in 1811 it was proposed and much discussed by the North Carolina Synod that a Seminary be established, but by 1814 these efforts and discussions were given up. In 1817 Philip Henkel and Joseph E. Bell, in Green Co., Tenn., had a small seminary, with which for a time the North Carolina Synod co-operated. But after the teachers withdrew to the Tennessee Synod the support of the North Carolina Synod was withdrawn and the school expired. In 1829 initiatory steps for the founding of a seminary were taken by the South Carolina Synod and a committee appointed to consider and report on this matter.

In 1830 the committee reported favorably and Rev. John G. Schwartz, who had been privately instructed in theology by Dr. Bachman, then pastor at Charleston, was elected first professor. Dr. Bachman, as president of the Synod, had done his utmost to bring this to pass. The work was actually begun in February of 1831, \$10,000 having been pledged for this purpose. In 1832 Lexington was decided upon as the most favorable location, and the seminary established there. Prior to this the young professor, John G. Schwartz, conducted the school in his home near Pomaria, Newberry County. But during the year fever laid violent hands upon him and the young professor passed from the church militant. "Dr. Bachman wept over the life of his young disciple, and at his grave, though bowed in deep grief, he urged the Church to look in humble trust to God for mercy and protection, and to press on in the work to which the Synod was most solemnly pledged." It was under such tragic circumstances that Dr. Ernst L. Hazelius, after only three years' stay at Gettysburg, with all of its larger prospects for him, consented to take up the work at Lexington, and in 1833 entered upon the new enterprise which, under the providence of God, has made the Southern Church what it is to-day. In 1836 arrangements were made with the North Carolina Synod to co-operate in the support of the institution. In 1842 Dr. Hazelius returned to Europe to visit his many friends and relatives. "He was earnestly entreated to return with his family and take up his permanent abode in the land of his nativity. The King of Prussia, Frederick William the IV, tendered him a lucrative and congenial position. Baron Block, a man of great influence, in whose family his only sister resided, did likewise. These and other tempting offers he refused. His heart was set upon his little seminary in the backwoods of South Carolina and to whose work he was indissolubly wedded." Hence he returned to Lexington and resumed his work that fall. Suffering from the infirmities of age, in 1852, with great reluctance, he resigned his professorship. He continued, nevertheless, to give instruction in Hebrew and other branches until Feb-

ruary 15, 1853, when he bade a last tearful farewell to his students and took to his bed, from which he never again arose. He died on February 20, 1853, after only a few days' illness. This man had received his Doctorate from both Union and Columbia Colleges in 1824, and had been offered a professorship in both Lafayette and Princeton.

It is an interesting coincidence that this same Dr. Hazelius who had been so active in the early days of the institutions at Hartwick, Gettysburg and Lexington, should have been the *indirect* cause of the action in founding the Theological Seminary in Ohio, a territory later occupied by the constituency of Wittenberg College and Seminary. Yet this seems to have been the case. In the spring of 1830, when the Synod of Ohio was in session at Zanesville, an official letter from Dr. Hazelius was received urging upon the Ohio Synod the sending of its young men, who were to prepare for the ministry, to Hartwick Seminary, until such time as the Ohio Synod would have its own seminary. A special committee reported on this letter, and it was in connection with the discussion of this report that action was taken deciding to establish a theological seminary within the bounds of the Ohio Synod. A seminary was opened on the 15th of October, 1830, at Canton, Ohio, with Pastor Wilhelm Schmidt as the professor and an enrollment of six students. The Synod had been founded in 1818, and in 1830 numbered twenty-nine pastors. Already in 1827 the English Conference of the Synod had petitioned the Synod "to establish a school where young men might be trained for the ministry." In 1829, at Lancaster, the Synod took action deploring the fact that the means were not yet at hand to realize the project. Then, in 1830, the action was taken *establishing the school*. Dr. Schodde, in his History of the Seminary, describes the confessional situation in connection with this action as follows:

"It is quite evident that other than external reasons led to this important step. Evidently the Ohioans were not altogether satisfied with the doctrinal status of the Eastern Lutherans. The Synod declared that it felt it

as a pressing necessity to found such an institution in the West and thereby to "establish a center from which the teachings of the Augsburg Confession could be spread in its literal and unmixed purity, and where the united spirit of our discipline could prevail, and notwithstanding the present times and their deceit, the inextinguishable characteristic of Lutheranism may be preserved." This same distinctively Lutheran character is also demanded by the "Constitution of the German Lutheran Seminary" which was adopted in 1833, of which paragraph 3 reads:

"Finally, it is also an object of this Seminary to give lectures in the theological course on the doctrines of our Church, as contained purely and undefiled in the Augsburg Confession and in the other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, and to aid with the available means of the Institution theological students or such as intend to become school teachers."

"It is significant in this connection that the interests of the congregational school were so clearly emphasized already at this time, but this was only in harmony with the spirit shown by the Synod from the outset.

"The confessional status of the institution is further set forth by the qualifications demanded of those who were to constitute its teaching corps. Of the professors, the constitution says: "They must also profess pure Lutheran principles contained in the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church." There is then no doubt that from the very beginning it was the purpose of the fathers to establish a school in which confessional and historical Lutheranism should find a home."

Thus we see that this was the first Lutheran Seminary in this country to be founded upon the basis of the Book of Concord.

Another interesting and significant feature of this new school was that it was to be a German seminary, although from the beginning both English and German were used because there were always students who could not understand the German. There was an English conference within the Synod, which was itself a purely German body,

and the English minutes of this conference were published beginning with the year 1830. The exact title of the school was to be "The Theological Institution of Learning of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio." Pastor Wilhelm Schmidt who was pastor of five congregations in and around Canton, Ohio, had joined the Synod in 1828, with strong letters of recommendation from the authorities of the University of Halle and also those of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. He was very scholarly. He served the Seminary without compensation for two years, and established a very strong curriculum. In 1832 the Seminary was removed to Columbus, the citizens of which place had offered \$2500 for the school, and Prof. Schmidt went with the school. A new building was occupied in January of 1833. Professor Schmidt's salary for the third year was \$250. He had an assistant in Adolph Konrad, who gave instruction in the languages and other branches while studying theology. Professor Schmidt was not a strict Lutheran, but was largely influenced by the unionistic spirit of that period. He received and instructed Reformed students for that Church. In 1836 the "Ohio Educational Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" was formed for the purpose of aiding "pious but indigent young men for the gospel ministry in the Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio." Professor Schmidt died of typhoid fever November 1st, 1839. An appropriate monument marks his resting place, with this inscription: "Wilhelm Schmidt—Unser Lehrer, Unser Vater. 1803-1839." His successor was Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer, then pastor at Hagerstown, Md. He began his work the summer of 1840. In the fall an assistant, Mr. C. Juksch, was added. A new building was erected in 1842 for a dormitory. Rev. Frederick Winckler, of Newark, N. J., was called as second professor in 1842. At this time differences over the language question became very acute, with the result that Professor Schaeffer resigned to take effect in June of 1843. Professor Winckler was retained until 1845. The growing English sentiment made possible action for the establishment, in 1841, of an English church paper entitled

The Lutheran Standard, edited by Rev. E. Greenwald, of New Philadelphia. This sets forth the general situation, synodical, confessional and linguistic which prevailed throughout the territory now covered by the constituency of Wittenberg College.

However, it should be added, in closing, that the Synod of the West had been formed in 1835 to represent the Church in Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and even farther west. The eastern part of this territory has always been part of the constituency of Wittenberg College. One of the first inquiries after this synod was organized, was as to the expediency of establishing a theological seminary, and of commencing a religious newspaper. In 1841 this synod united with the General Synod, and within the next year plans for establishing a theological seminary and of publishing a religious paper in the English language were not only finally resolved upon, but measures were taken for the accomplishment of both objects. A commencement was made in collecting funds for the seminary, and a constitution for said seminary was discussed and adopted. The proposed paper was to be styled *The Western Lutheran Observer*, and Rev. George Jaeger was appointed editor. At this time this young synod which began in 1835 with six ministers, now had a clerical roll of twenty-three.

This then is a resume of theological education, conducted under individual and institutional auspices, in the Lutheran Church in this country prior to the founding of Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845.

York, Pa.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.*

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

A belief in the supernatural is universal. Religion in some form characterizes every race and tribe of men. Man is incurably religious. Of the many forms of religion, Christianity is undoubtedly incomparably superior to all the rest. It is the absolute religion. But within its fold there are naturally great varieties of belief as represented by the many denominations. For the present purpose these may be divided into two general classes: Catholic and Protestant. The former embraces the Roman, and the Greek Catholics, and several smaller sects; the latter the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches and numerous sectarian bodies. In the Protestant branch of the Church, where naturally liberty of thought and of speech exist, there prevails a wide diversity of belief. There is a strong tendency among those who have carried the hypotheses of evolution into the history of religion to break away from the ancient and almost universally accepted standards.

The central point is the question of authority. Is there an invariable standard of belief by which we can determine what must be accepted or rejected? This is an entirely reasonable inquiry; conscience demands it in the perplexity in which one often finds himself. History shows that the Church has always met this demand in one way or another.

The devout Jew accepts a "thus saith the Lord" as final. The story of the Hebrew people shows that they rose or fell in proportion to the fidelity with which they held to their ancient Scriptures. Their history is the vindication of the authenticity and authority of the Old Testament.

* A paper read at the dedication of the buildings of the Hamma Divinity School, Springfield Ohio.

“To the law and to the testimony” is still the appeal of the orthodox Israelite.

In the brief period of our Lord’s ministry on earth His word was authoritative. During the life time of His apostles and first disciples this authority continued through the traditional transmission of the things which they had seen and heard. As they could not be omnipresent their knowledge and interpretation of Christ and His words and works were committed to writing, and this survives in the books of the New Testament. It is not possible here to show how this was formed, nor to prove its authenticity and genuineness; but it is certain that to the early Church the New Testament was authoritative.

In the course of time the Roman papacy arrogated to itself the exclusive right to interpret the Bible and the ancient tradition. While these pretensions have always met with vehement protest within and without the Romish Church, they have prevailed to such an extent that papal infallibility finally became a fixed dogma (1870). In spite of “modernism” and various other counter movements during the centuries, the Roman Pontiff is the seat of authority in the Church over which he presides and which embraces a very large and influential part of all professed Christians.

The chief revolt against Romanism, which had enslaved the conscience by its tyranny, took place in the sixteenth century under the leadership of Luther. In the emancipation of the Protestant Church, the authority of the pope was, of course, rejected, and another substituted. This new authority was after all nothing but the old authority of the words of our Lord as enshrined and developed in the New Testament—the Gospel. Luther in his magnificent stand at Worms epitomizes the Protestant attitude of the past four centuries. He declared, “Unless I am convicted by Scripture or by right reason (for I trust neither in popes nor in councils, since they have often erred and contradicted themselves)—unless I am thus convinced, I am bound by the texts of the Bible, my conscience is captive to the Word of God, I neither

can nor will recant anything, since it is neither right nor safe to act against conscience. God help me. Amen." It has been said by Professor McGiffert and others that Luther was right at first in confining authority to the *Gospel*, that is to the immediate word of Christ, but that he later abandoned this attitude and included the whole Bible. This interpretation of Luther is quite unsympathetic. Luther to the end held to his first view of the Gospel, as the message of grace to man, but he realized also that the whole Bible was God's word and preached and defended it with all his might.

The seat of authority of the Lutherans in abandoning the papacy, then, was the word of God, and this is assumed in all its confessions and plainly expressed in the Introduction of the Formula of Concord, as follows: "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament."

The Reformed symbols of the Reformation period are equally emphatic in their acceptance of the Bible. Thus the Second Helvetic Confession (A. D. 1566) says: "We believe and confess the Canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of both Testaments to be the true Word of God, and to have sufficient authority of themselves, not of men. For God Himself spake to the fathers, prophets, apostles, and still speaks to us through the Holy Scriptures."

But according to Prof. McGiffert the Reformation was a comparative failure in revealing the true seat of authority. He says, "The change in the organ of authority from Church to Bible did not mean the abandonment of the medieval for the modern point of a view. As a matter of fact, the new authority was just as external as the old, and submission to it just as slavish. The change to be sure promoted liberty, both by breaking the control of the Catholic Church, the greatest foe of freedom, and also by encouraging the formation of mutually hostile sects based upon diverse interpretations of the Bible. But the

principle of authority was as medieval in historic Protestantism as in Catholicism, and it was only lack of historical imagination which for so long prevented Protestants from realizing the fact.”¹

The human mind is restless; it is ever seeking the new. The Reformation was succeeded by various movements which have a decided influence on the question of religious authority. A period of dead orthodoxy was followed in the seventeenth century by Pietism, with its emphasis on personal, individual experience, and its relative indifference to creeds. The rise of Pietism prepared the way for the Enlightenment, with its new and accurate mathematical methods, which threatened the foundations of revelation and theology and which led to the rise of new philosophic systems resting upon a purely naturalistic basis. And though at first the new philosophy was not antagonistic to religion, yet, the whole aspect of the world of thought was changed. Miracles became impossible except to the casuist; the earth was removed from its central position in the universe and became only a point in space; anthropocentrism was destroyed. The spirit of the eighteenth century assumed its characteristic qualities; it became atomistic, analytic, mechanical, practical; entirely on the side of the known and the evident, entirely opposed to all that was dark, mystic or fantastic.”²

“Second only in importance to the mathematical sciences was the development of a new historical method, universal, secular and philosophical, as opposed to the theological and antiquarian historiography that came before.” The essays of Bolingbroke and Voltaire dealt decisive blows at traditional methods and opened the way for the explanation of all history by natural laws and, of course, destroyed faith in the Bible as a divine revelation.

The rationalistic tendency of the Enlightenment received a check through the Kantian philosophy which substituted “practical reason” or experience for “pure reason,” allowing comparatively little room for an ob-

¹ The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas, p. 283.

² See article on Enlightenment in Schaff—Herzog Encyl.

jective revelation. Kant may be regarded as the forerunner of the modern empirical movement, which reduces religion to a direct personal experience not mediated by Scripture.

Schleiermacher applied the Kantian philosophy to theology, making religion simply "a feeling of dependence on God," and redemption "the transit from restricted to unrestricted consciousness of God." "The sole factor in the redemptive work of Christ, in the opinion of Schleiermacher, was his person; his supernatural birth, resurrection, ascension and second advent were regarded as of little moment."

The legitimate successor of Schleiermacher was Ritschl who, however, lays greater emphasis upon Christ as the content of Christian experience. The Christ of Ritschl, however, is not the Christ of orthodox theology. He is one who has the value of God to the believer. Whether Ritschl really believed in the deity of our Lord is a matter of dispute. He has apparently no faith in the inspiration of the Bible as the Word of God.

In more recent times the authority of the Scriptures as a norm of belief has been attacked, among many, by Sabatier who says that "the utterances of Jesus being known to us only by apostolic tradition, nothing can guarantee to us that the tradition has preserved to us the entire thought of the Saviour or always with the meaning which it had upon his lips for those who heard him and which was determined by the occasion."³

Sabatier also maintains that the Catholic view of authority is preferable to the Protestant. "The Church has this first superiority over the Bible: that it is a social organism, alive, contemporaneous, flexible, able to deal with all new questions. * * * The Bible on the contrary is a document of the past, a book whose form and ideas are those of a certain date, and respond to a definite degree of culture and state of civilization. * * * In the second place the Catholic system has much more grandeur than the other. It is one thing to reason on the value of a

3 "Religions of Authority," pp. 226, 186, 187.

book, and another to create, through eighteen centuries of history, by an uninterrupted series of efforts and conflicts, a religious empire like that of Rome. * * * What is the Protestant system beside all this? * * The Protestant dogma of the infallibility of the Bible is not only unconceivable to thought—it is also useless in fact.”

Sabatier also, in common with modern liberal theology, practically denies the personality of the Holy Spirit. He says that “in the Old Testament and the New the Spirit represented the divine principle in the human soul, the immanent influence of the living God.” Then again Christ is the Spirit, and again he imparts His Spirit, and His religion is the religion of the Spirit—of joy and of freedom. Christian experience is said to be something clear and accurately determined. “This experience first of all took place in the consciousness of Jesus Christ, and from Him has been shed abroad in every conscience which has a sense both of spiritual misery and of reconciliation with the Father by faith in the good news of His infinite love.” (p. 362).

McGiffert declares that the Protestant conception of authority is more mechanical and inelastic than the Catholic, and that “the Protestant doctrine of an infallible and self-interpreting Bible is bound to disappear from the minds of thinking men long before the Catholic doctrine of an infallible Church.”⁴

The quotation is an evidence, however, of the fact that an objective authority of some sort makes a powerful appeal to the human mind.

The step from an objective authority to a vague subjectivism is sure to be followed by another step which leads by way of “comparative religion” to a further degradation of the Bible. The late Karl Burger (Schaff-Herzog, 7:278) declared that a struggle was pending which might lead to the last schism in Christianity. The struggle which he foresaw was not one concerning individual doctrines or ecclesiastical positions, but concerning two opposite views of the universe. “For if,” says

4 Rise of Modern Religious Ideas, p. 283, 284.

he, "ostensibly to ethicize Christianity, its nerve of faith be severed, if the essential divinity of Christ be replaced by his human uniqueness, if the Bible be dethroned for the consciousness of the community, then there is no longer a mere conflict between orthodoxy and heterodoxy; but the existence of the confessional Churches is imperiled, and the way is opened for the formation of entirely new types of religious organization. Protestantism is evidently destined to surrender to this new development. The antithesis is no longer between the conservative and the liberal theology. The question is whether Christianity is to maintain itself as the religion of revelation, or is to lapse to a mere phase of the general evolution of religious history."

Such is the situation and such are its antecedents, as we have endeavored to sketch them briefly. While most of the purely denominational Seminaries are still true to the conservative views of the Bible, the undenominational Seminaries have practically all become liberal. Whether this latest assault has spent its force is questionable, though destructive criticism has no doubt received a backset. But the Church needs to be forever watching against the insidious teachings which underestimate the Bible, and cause great havoc in the Church. The faithful, however, need have no fear as to the final outcome. We have our Lord's own assurance that the gates of hell shall never prevail against His Church, and that heaven and earth shall pass away but that His word shall not pass away.

To many of us the simple and final answer to all objections to the Bible is the incontrovertible fact that there is only one Bible, one great Book, and that faith in it and obedience to it have made men and nations great and free. This can not be said of anything else in all the world.

In the examination of the claims of those who argue for reason and experience as the seat of authority in religion, it becomes necessary to determine the meaning of the terms employed, for it seems to us that there is great looseness in the use of language. Our first inquiry shall be as to

THE NATURE OF TRUE RELIGION.

The view that one holds in respect to religion is determinative not only of the matter of authority but of even life and hope. If religion be simply what Schleiermacher regards it, "a feeling after God" it would seem to us to have no content. Religion would mean only that man has a capacity for religion, that he has a moral nature, a conscience, that he is susceptible to divine influence. This is no doubt true but this is not religion according to any rational conception of it. To say further with Schleiermacher and his followers that "religion is rooted in the feelings, and that the religious man is he who feels his oneness with the Absolute" is to confound an experience of religion with its source.

Religion does not originate in the soul. It does not consist in a search after God. It is not even the apprehension of God as much as being apprehended by God. "He takes the initiative and approaches us. Our knowledge is the result of His revelation. We find Him because He first finds us. That is to say, the main thing, the unique thing, in religion is not a God whom we know but a God who knows us. Religion turns not on knowing but on being known. * * * It is a knowledge in which he does not simply take cognizance of us, but knows us in a special sense, with such a creative intimacy as love alone provides. In religion the fundamental movement of the knowledge is in the reverse direction from that of science. In science we move to the object of knowledge; in religion it moves to us. We know Him as we love Him, because He first knew and loved us."⁵

The attitude of receptiveness in a man is faith. In its essence it is more than mere assent; it is confidence, or trust. To have saving faith in Christ means to trust in Him for forgiveness and salvation. This faith is not a mere intellectual operation; it embraces the affections and the will. Nor do these originate faith. It is the gift of God, even though it be the personal act of man. God

5 Forsyth, "The Principle of Authority," p. 167 f.

awakens faith in man, gives him power to believe. It is an essential element in the process of salvation. Religion and faith belong to the same category.

When the liberal speaks of Jesus commending Himself to our faith, he seems to regard faith as a critical judgment; but this is not religious but intellectual faith. It is not Pauline, but Romish in its content.

The next matter to be considered is

THE NATURE OF AUTHORITY.

Authority is that from which there is no appeal. It is a power which demands acquiescence or submission. As a principle it is universal. In the domain of reason it compels the acceptance of axioms or postulates, which though not always demonstrable, are felt to be fundamental to all thinking. There are great laws running through the universe which the mind may discover but it can in no wise create or destroy them. When these laws are discovered by man they are recognized at once as authoritative.

In society there is an underlying law which produces order, security and happiness. Its violation brings oppression and in the end anarchy. This principle is recognized by the apostle when he says, "The powers that be are ordained of God."

In the various departments of human activity the idea of authority is recognized in persons who have attained great eminence. Thus we say that Bryce is authority on democracy, and Blackstone on law, and Bach in music, and Remsen in chemistry. Their dicta are generally accepted without question. The principle of authority is not in conflict with true independence of thought within the range of its possibilities. But no sane man would pretend that he is an authority on all subjects or that he has exhausted even a single one. He realizes his dependence every day. It is true that some persons are wiser than others, and that in a few things they can act on their own initiative. But there are few leaders, and these are guided by precedents.

The absurdity of claiming the right of personal independence and authority becomes apparent when applied to ordinary life. Should every member of society declare his independence of all existing authority and hold in suspension all usages and all laws until he should have weighed them on the little scales of his own judgment, there would be no likelihood of speedy agreement, but rather of the speedy dissolution of the bonds of society.

The nature of authority is largely objective. The norm or standard is external rather than internal. Even when we think that we are acting independently, we will discover that we are trying to conform to some ideal. The moral judgment which we pronounce on ourselves and on others is the comparison of what is and what ought to be. And what ought to be is simply conformity to some external example. .

We insist on authority as a real and a necessary element in all thought and life. It is demanded by the ignorance, immaturity and limitations of man. He must accept in large measure what others bequeath him. As he grows he may elevate the standard, but he must begin by taking the one which then exists.

If there is to be on earth a society called the Church it must rest on some agreement concerning principles and methods. There must be the recognition of a central thought and the yielding to its authority. Few may understand theology or ecclesiology but they are ready to yield to those who are wiser, as long as the unifying spirit of Christ is evident.

Even a man's personal religion is the acceptance of an authoritative Lord, one who comes to him from without and not from within.

But it is needless to argue a matter that has universal acceptance. All rational beings accept the idea of authority in religion, and there can be no disagreement as to its ultimate source and seat. It is in God, the Creator. His holiness, His intrinsic and perfect moral excellence is the standard of right. And His incarnate Son is the manifestation and revelation of the divine nature, without whose earthly life and words God cannot truly be

known. But He lived ages ago, and the only record we have of Him is in the Bible. And as all authority must be external and tangible how are we to be guided now? What provision has He made? Are we to take the alleged Scriptures as the seat of authority, or is there a more excellent way. This is really the question before us. The substitute which modern liberal theology insists on is reason or experience, the two being closely allied. The old bondage to a Book must be broken. In derision it has been called a "paper pope." It is demanded that the Creeds based upon this book be thrown on the scrap-heap of outworn theories. It is assumed that the fathers of the Church knew no more about religion than they knew about science. They forget that there were giants in those days, men who thought more deeply on eternal realities than on temporal vanities.

THE CLAIM OF REASON EXAMINED.

"Reason must rule" is the modern cry. Of course it must, in its proper domain. The Bible Christian has the same right to claim its service as any one else. The sceptic has no monopoly of it. Its function is to discover what is discoverable, but even in the prosecution of the physical sciences, reason has its limitations; but the scientist does not stop. He invokes probability, hypothesis, faith, to help him on.

In the domain of religion unaided reason makes little progress. Without the light of revelation the wisest men of all the ages have groped in the dark. But so potent a fact does not seem to deter the would-be wise men of these latter days to sin against the very light by which alone they see at all.

The effort to make the study of religion a purely inductive science is unphilosophical and barren of spiritual results. Concerning this Forsyth has well said: "The inductive and scientific laws are not compatible with the moral freedom which is a first requisite of religion as it rises in the spiritual scale. The will, the moral man, must carry its ruling principles in itself. It cannot wait

upon those of the pure intellect. We cannot wait to believe in Christ till a due examination of the religious psychology of the race, or of the metaphysic behind it, gives us leave. * * There is no inherent and obvious necessity that the will should act according to the principles of the reason, and it often (some say mostly) acts in their despite. These principles of the will can be intellectually stated, but they are not principles of the intellect, of absolute disinterested science. Science must be disinterested, religion, conscience, can never be." (Principles of Authority, p. 197 f.)

The practical result of reducing religion to a purely rational basis has always ended disastrously. The Scriptures have been neglected, the Churches forsaken, and moral restraints loosened. The advocates of reason as the seat of authority have not made good their claims.

THE CLAIMS OF EXPERIENCE EXAMINED.

"To-day," says McGiffert, "there are few American Christians of liberal tendencies, still fewer German and English Christians, who do not recognize that religious authority is a matter of the spirit, not of the letter, that its seat is to be found ultimately, not in external rules and formulas or codes, but in a man's experience, and that only that can bind his thought and conscience which vitally appeals to him and meets with a response in his own inner nature."⁶ Experience, thought, conscience—these are the watchwords of the new faith. How flattering to the pride of man! These things are spoken of as though they were recent discoveries and the peculiar possession of the liberals. The insinuation is implied that the conservative has no genuine "experience," no deep "thought," nor quick "conscience."

Now as a fact no body insists quite as much on a deep religious experience as the Bible Christian. He knows very well that the letter killeth and that the spirit maketh alive. He does not soothe his soul with a blind accept-

6 The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas, p. 297.

ance of things which do not quicken him. He claims that in the old fountain of the Bible he has found cleansing and quickening.

But what is this experience of the new theology? It would be hard to find exact agreement, except in the general rejection of the Bible as the rule of faith. Miracles are discredited. The virgin birth is a myth. The atonement by the blood of the cross is a mere symbol. The Christ of the Gospels barely survives. A thin etching of the original remains. He is said to have "the value of God" to us! The doctrine in the final analysis is Socinianism modified by a lack of courage. This Jesus, who has been created by a scientific imagination, now presents himself at the bar of man's judgment, and by a species of mystical jugglery is admitted to the heart! And this is the beautiful and rich experience which "the orthodox" are to seek after, if they would live! The language may seem extravagant, but it conveys the truth.

The Christ of the liberal is not the Christ of the Bible. He is only a good man in whom God was well pleased and upon whom he bestowed His Spirit in rich measure; but he was bound by the limitations of His age to such a degree that He was even deceived as to the existence of evil spirits and kindred errors!

We insist on experience of the right kind, but experience is not final. It has no authority. At its best it bows before the authority of One who must ever be the source of all truth and life. Religion "must come home by our experience, but it must far transcend it. We believe far ahead of our experience, even though we believe in terms of it. Experience is the field where our theology arises, but it is not the spring. The matter of such theology, its Word, is a revelation which speaks the language of experience but with the voice of eternal God."

Experience without a fixed objective standard ends in pure subjectivism, as variable as the individual. Nothing but confusion ever has come from it. No permanent society can rest upon such a basis, and it must inevitably degenerate into mysticism or rationalism. In decrying

the pope of Rome, and the "paper pope" of the Protestant, the liberal makes every man a pope.

THE CLAIM OF SCRIPTURE VINDICATED.

A divine revelation is certainly a postulate of theism. The possibility of it can not be doubted. Communication between the divine Person and His children is also extremely probable. In view of the gift of His Son this revelation is not only possible and probable, but actually demonstrated. The only question which a doubter might ask is whether the heavenly Ambassador caused an authentic record to be made of His word and work. The Church has always affirmed this, and on this fact is built the Protestant Church. It would seem exceedingly improbable that an Almighty and All-wise Savior would commit His coming, life and death to the uncertainties of mere tradition. Neither is it credible that those who have given us the story were either fools or knaves. They were men whose character and writings have influenced generations, and who sealed their convictions with their blood.

On the background of the history of the Jewish people, whose existence can be traced three thousand years, stands the New Testament recording the fulfilment of the hopes of the Jews. This fact alone contains the proof that the Bible is a divinely directed book. No man has ever yet successfully answered the argument from prophecy, nor refuted the evidences of eye witnesses of the glory of Christ. Nor can any one deny the unity, the naturalness, the appropriateness and the moving power of the sacred Scriptures. Nor will any one gainsay their influence for good in the history of the world.

Opposition to the reception of the Bible as a divine revelation proceeds from a variety of motives; prejudice, wickedness or a mistaken idea of what they are intended to be, the last being the ground of the honest critic. It is alleged that the Bible is not always true to fact, that some things in it are highly improbable, and that it is full of irreconcilable contradictions. So good a man as James

Martineau in his book *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, published twenty-five years ago, descended to such trivialities of fault-finding as to vitiate the entire volume. Let it be granted for the sake of argument that the geography, history and psychology are not always inerrant, this does not destroy the doctrines which it promulgates and especially the life which it reveals.

The content of revelation is Jesus Christ; and His relation to it and to us relieves its acceptance by us of all real difficulty. Whatever of miracle may be involved in our Lord's mission can be more readily accepted than could any other explanation of his history. It is utterly incredible that mere coincidences extending over centuries should have eventuated in the unique person and life of Jesus. The prophetic foreshadowing of the Old Testament and the expectation of the Advent can not be explained on a naturalistic basis. And it is just as inconceivable that this Lord, who has affected the best portion of mankind by His holiness and His teaching, should have been utterly unconscious of the role He was playing; and it is even more incredible that He should have permitted His apostles to misunderstand and to misinterpret Him.

His own testimony to the integrity and inspiration of the Old Testament is a sufficient guarantee to us. And the New Testament which throbs with His own message to man is amply authenticated by all the evidences external and internal, near and remote which can possibly make any document credible.

The Bible is a book but much more than a book. It is not merely historic. It does not deal with a dead hero who lived centuries ago. It is the message of the ever-living Christ and always remains his word. The Gospel is a miracle wrought by God, who thus by the external word accompanied by the Holy Spirit ever reproduces the Christian life in those who accept it. It throbs with its message of grace. Its words are spirit and life. They are not simply information but they are really the act of God.

The apostolic writers do not record mere subjective

experiences but actual facts of whose character they were certainly the most competent judges, and of whose meaning they were the true interpreters, the chosen instruments of God for the transmission of the facts of salvation to posterity.

The Bible is also not a mere depository of truth, but the divine medium for the transmission of grace, the organ of the Spirit through which He actually conveys life and salvation to the believer and through which He makes it possible to hold communion with the Father and the Son. The denial of this truth and the substitution of an immediate knowledge of God and of fellowship with Him has always ended in fanaticism.

The denial of the integrity of the Holy Scriptures involves the denial of the personality of the Holy Spirit. If there be no inspiration and no need of inspiration then there is no place in Christian thought for the Holy Spirit and of all that is involved in what is known as the application of redemption. The whole fabric of Trinitarian Christianity falls with the denial of the word of inspiration, and there is nothing substantial and objective left for acceptance and for a basis of Christian faith. A sentimental subjectivism is the residuum of this process. Authority has been converted into a mere personal opinion which is no authority at all.

The force of our position, that it has pleased God to make an authoritative revelation in the Bible, becomes apparent when we imagine, if we can, the situation that would exist were all knowledge of the Bible obliterated. Where then would be the Jesus that is now alleged to appeal of faith? There would be no knowledge of Him; He would be obliterated. There would be no Christian institutions, no advanced civilization. And the world at best would be what we have in China and Japan.

It may be urged that we have other books, like the writings of the apostolic fathers, which would give us a knowledge of the facts of Christ's life. In answer to this it may be said that much of the contents of these writings is borrowed from the New Testament, and that the original parts of them are so inferior in their appre-

hension and interpretation of the Christian religion that they have justly been denied a place in the canon.

The sacred Scriptures bear not only all the marks of divine guidance, but possess all the characteristics of authority—objectivity, universality, spirituality, equity, majesty, personality.

The ultimate proof of our contention must be sought in the evidence of those who have accepted the view which we advocate. These certainly include the best men and women who have ever lived, and are numbered by hundreds of thousands. Never in the history of America has the Bible been studied as widely as to-day. The extraordinary growth of Bible classes for men is a witness to the inherent power of the Bible to interest the minds of all kinds of people.

The positions which we have taken are violently controverted by those who would condition religion by subjectivity. Being wise above what is written they must be permitted to follow their own way. But it becomes the duty of all who love the Word, because it has brought them salvation, to bear continued and earnest witness to the truth as it is in Jesus.

A peculiar responsibility seems to devolve upon the Lutheran Church in America in this age of religious unrest. Whatever differences may exist between the several bodies of Lutherans there is remarkable unity of faith in the Bible as the Word of God. While others have yielded to the persistent efforts of liberalistic teachers, the theological schools of the Lutherans have been kept free from the blight of destructive criticism. There are no doubt many in other Churches who make the Bible "the man of their counsel" yet the Lutheran Church is the largest organized body which has stood unmoved upon the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture, and it is to this conservative body of Christians that other Christians look with confidence hoping that it will continue "to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Church Union and Church Federation are in the air. The most general movement for unity on the basis of historical Christianity is known as the "Conference on Faith and Order" inaugurated by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. As preliminary to a conference to be held in Garden City, N. Y., in January the Rev. Dr. William Thomas Manning, "Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Commission, appointed by the P. E. Church to bring about a World Conference for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order," has contributed an article on "The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Unity" to *The Constructive Quarterly* (Dec. 1915) in which he sets forth the attitude of his Church.

He holds in the first place that it is the special work of the P. E. Church to bring about a synthesis of the whole of Christendom, because the P. E. Church is neither Roman or Greek Catholic or even Protestant. It is Catholic.

Dr. Manning writes as follows:

"In the Providence of God it would seem that the Episcopal Church, together with the Churches which are included in the Anglican communion, has a special work to do toward bringing about a great synthesis in the whole of Christendom. Her mission seems to be to hold up, and bear witness to, the ideal of Christian reunion in its fullest and largest meaning. She has been given a special relation to the world situation as a whole and she must be true to it. By her fundamental faith as to the nature of the Church and also by the practical facts of her history and life she is called to look at the question of reunion in its world-wide aspect and, to the best of her power, 'to think in terms of the whole.' To a singular

degree she is enabled and required by the peculiarities of her position to take into account the factors on both the Protestant and Catholic sides in the West and also to realize the great place which belongs to the Ancient Eastern Oorthodox Churches, as to which until recently many of us have been so amazingly ignorant, and which are now coming into close touch with the rest of the Christian world."

In the second place the P. E. Church claims to hold the only true doctrine of the ministry, as set forth in the following abstract:

"Again in common with all the ancient Communion, including at least three-fourths of all Christendom, the Episcopal Church believes that when our Lord founded His Church in this world, He Himself appointed a self-perpetuating ministry and that this ministry has come down to the present time through the succession of the Bishops. The Episcopal Church holds the Catholic doctrine that a priest, ordained by a bishop, in direct succession from the Apostles, is indispensably necessary for the celebration to the Holy Communion, the central and characteristic act of the Christian Church. She pronounces no judgment as to the efficacy of sacred ordinances otherwise administered. But she holds herself bound wholly to the ancient ways which she believes to be of God's own appointment."

In the third place the following reasons are given for standing aloof from Protestant Church Federation:

"In her doctrine of the Church and the Priesthood, the Anglican Communion allies herself with Catholic Christendom, and it is this fact which makes it impossible for the Episcopal Church, without surrender of fundamental principle, to identify herself with the present movement for Protestant Federation in America or to enter into United Protestant work in the mission fields or elsewhere. The Episcopal Church should feel, and does feel, warm sympathy with these movements. She should join in thanksgiving for them as a most hopeful expression of growing desire for reunion, and as important steps in this direction. She ought in every right way to manifest her

sympathy with these efforts, and to show that she wishes them Godspeed, but she cannot officially participate in, and commit herself to, them without being untrue to the opportunity which God seems to have given her in relation to the Christian Church as a whole, and denial of her own essential faith."

The London Quarterly Review (Oct. 1915) has a spirited article on "Prayer" by Principal Forsyth, from which we quote the following:

"A prayer is also a promise. Every true prayer carries with it a vow. If it do not, it is not in earnest. It is not of a piece with life. Can we pray in earnest if we do not in the act commit ourselves to do our best to bring about the answer? Can we escape some kind of hypocrisy? This is especially so with intercession. What is the value of praying for the poor if all the rest of our time and interest is given only to becoming rich? Where is the honesty of praying for our country if in our most active hours we are chiefly occupied in making something out of it, if we are strange to all sacrifice for it? Prayer is one form of sacrifice, but if it is the only form it is vain oblation. If we pray for our child that he may have God's blessing we are really promising that nothing shall be lacking on our part to be a divine blessing to him. And if we have no kind of religious relation to him (as plenty of Christian parents have none), our prayer is quite unreal, and its failure should not be a surprise. To pray for God's kingdom is also to engage ourselves to service and sacrifice for it. To begin our prayer with a petition for the hallowing of God's name and to have no real and prime place for holiness in our life or faith is not sincere. The prayer of the vindictive for forgiveness is mockery, like the prayer for daily bread from a wheat cornerer. No such man could say the Lord's Prayer but to his judgment. What would happen to the Church if the Lord's Prayer became a test for membership as thoroughly as the creeds have been? The Lord's Prayer is also a vow to the Lord. None but a Christian can pray it or should. Great worship of God is also a great en-

gagement of ourselves, a great committal of our action. To begin the day with prayer is but a formality unless it go on in prayer, unless for the rest of it we pray in deed what we began in word. One has said that while prayer is the day's best beginning it must not be like the handsome title page of a worthless book."

The International Review of Missions (Oct.) in an article by A. K. Reischauer on "Japanese Buddhism and Christianity" shows the utter inadequacy of the former as contrasted with the latter.

"Buddhist history is the strongest proof of its inadequacy. Over and over again Buddhists have sought to bring God back into their religion, but somehow or other the old agnostic spirit of the founder of Buddhism has always risen up and darkened the Buddhist heart so that it has worshipped the creatures of its own imagination rather than the Creator. Buddhist history is eloquent with attempts to meet the deepest needs of the human heart, and the Christian should treat all these attempts with the profoundest sympathy, but he should also see clearly that this need cannot be fully met except as it met with the positive faith in the Heavenly Father which comes through contact with Jesus Christ."

"This positive faith, I believe, cannot be grafted on the old Buddhist stock, for there it would be in danger of being choked by the many wild branches of superstition or a barren speculative philosophy which usually ends in the 'unknowable Absolute' of agnosticism. The new wine cannot be put into the old Buddhist wineskins. Nor would it be wise, in the second place, to try to bring Buddhism *en masse* into the Christian fold by pointing out the similarities between the two religions. That would only swamp the Christian life. The only safe and effective way is to win individual Buddhists to a real faith in the living God by presenting the faith with such a sense of reality that men may know that at the back of the theological idea of God is God, at the back of the idea of a Saviour is the historic and ever-living Saviour Jesus Christ, that greater than the ethical ideals is

the truly sanctified Christian life, and that beyond the idea of a future life is an eternal life which he who possesses may know by its very quality to be a life which must abide the wreck of time."

The Right Hon. Viscount Bryce, well known as the author of "American Democracy," in discussing "Facts and Questions Before Us," before the British Academy, as printed in *The Hibbert Journal* (Oct.) has the following to say on the effect of the great war on the future population:

"This suggests the gravest of all the questions that confront us. How will population be affected in quality and quantity? The birthrate had before 1914 been falling in Germany and Britain: it had already fallen so low in France as only to equal the deathrate. Will the withdrawal of those slain or disabled in war quicken it? and how long will it take to restore the productive industrial capacity of each country? More than half the students and younger teachers in some of our universities have gone to fight abroad: and many of these will never return. Who can estimate what is being lost to literature and learning and science, from the deaths of those whose strong and cultivated intelligence might have made great discoveries or added to the store of the world's thought? Those who are now perishing belong to the most healthy and vigorous part of the population, from whom the strongest progeny might have been expected. Will the physical and mental energy of the generation that will come to manhood thirty or forty years hence show a decline? The data for a forecast are scanty, for in no previous war has the loss of life been so great over Europe as a whole, even in proportion to a population very much larger than it was a century ago. It is said, I know not with how much truth, that the stature and physical strength of the population of France took long to recover from the losses of the wars that lasted from 1793 till 1814. Niebuhr thought that the population of the Roman Empire never recovered from the great plague of the second century A. D.; but where it is disease that re-

duces a people it is the weaker who die, while in war it is the stronger. Our friends of the Eugenics Society are uneasy at the prospect for the belligerent nations. Some of them are trying to console themselves by dwelling on the excellent moral effects that may spring out of the stimulation which war gives to the human spirit. What the race loses in body it may—so they hope—regain in soul. This is a highly speculative anticipation, on which history casts no certain light. As to the exaltation of character which war service produces in those who fight from noble motives, inspired by faith in the justice of their cause, there can be no doubt. We see it to-day as it has often been seen before. But how far does this effect the non-combatant part of each people? and how long does the exaltation last? The instance nearest to our own time, and an instance which is in so far typical that the bulk of the combatants on both sides were animated by a true patriotic spirit, is the instance of the American War of Secession. It was felt at the time to be almost a moral rebirth of the nation.”

We quote with pleasure the following words from *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oct.) written by Dr. Edwin S. Carr in a review of Bacon's "Christianity Old and New."

"As an orthodox Congregational clergyman, I desire to state that neither Professor Bacon, nor Doctor George A. Gordon, nor any other of our theological reformers whose names now come to mind, is authorized to speak for me, as a defender of our ancient and orthodox faith. If forced to a choice, rather than accept the fake Christ of Bacon's new Christianity or the phantom Christ of the Mystical Idealists, I would at once choose the comparatively reasonable and historically comprehensible Jesus of President Eliot. As I am confident that the rank and file of our orthodox Congregational membership will agree with me, when they understand the absurdly illusory nature of the 'reconstructions' of our New Theology. I believe that our Congregational Churches are of too high a level of intelligence to be permanently deceived by those combinations of fallacy and fake."

The Reformed Church Review (Oct.), in a discussion on "Moral and Physical Evil," by Paul J. Dundore, offers the following extenuation of the permission of Moral Evil in the world:

"In the life and teachings of Christ we find the only solution whereby we may overcome evil. Evil can only be overcome by the incorporation of the divine life into the human life. The divine life must become a supplement to the human. It is when we draw on the divine springs of power that we are able to triumph over moral evil."

"God, who finds His fullest expression in His creatures, has not only given us a conception of Himself but has revealed Himself in concrete form in the person of Christ. Here we have the perfect embodiment of His love and righteousness. To realize that ideal brought us in the person of Christ is to transcend the evil present in human life. The good is attained by bringing the self in harmony with the ideal Man and by willing what is in consonance with the divine will. God has not only communicated Himself to man by bringing Christ to earth in the flesh, but by His Spirit He continues to communicate Himself to us. It is His nature to communicate Himself to His creatures, whom He loves with an eternal love. In the measure man responds to His love and realizes in his life the self-communicating Spirit of God he is able to resist the evil and receive forgiveness of sin wherein he has done amiss. There is not yet a perfect reconciliation, for man is developing; but the indwelling Spirit helps us to attain the end 'to which the whole creation moves.' "

In the same number of the *Reformed Church Review*, Dr. Herman of the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, makes the following frank avowal:

"And those of you who are familiar with the Mercersburg theology, or who have sat at the feet of Doctor Gerhart and remember his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, will recognize the influence of Dorner upon the Christian doctrine that was taught in this Seminary in former days. It was Dorner's conception of the incarnation which was made the reproach of the Mercersburg theologians by those who were not in touch or in harmony

with the advancing Protestantism of Europe, and which, in our judgment, constitutes their glory. Our fathers and teachers were fellow-pilgrims with us on the path that leads from Schleiermacher through Dorner to Ritschl. We should have stood where they stood a generation ago, had we been their contemporaries. Perhaps, we may affirm also, they would to-day stand shoulder to shoulder with us in loyal adherence to the principles and methods of modern dogmatics which are but the continuation and completion of their own. Like them we are Christological in principle and Christocentric in method. It is the method which arrives at God through Jesus and which uses the knowledge so gained as the final principle for the interpretation of life, for the understanding of the meaning of the world in which we live, and the end to which we are called. And if we differ from them, it is not in the substance of our Christian faith but in its form. If we no longer call Jesus 'the logos' we still call Him 'Saviour and Lord.' If we no longer regard him as the incarnation of a transcendent metaphysical deity, we still see in him the incarnation of the Father, whose immeasurable love he revealed and whose eternal purpose he manifested. And if we have advanced beyond the positions and conclusions held by them, we have not been led away, either by higher criticism, by evolutionary science, or by immanent philosophy, from the one great Christian fact that, in and through Jesus Christ, the absolute God is redeeming the world from sin."

If Dr. Herman can "no longer call Jesus the Logos," then he has ceased to be Johannine in his faith. And if he sees in Jesus simply "the incarnation of the Father," then Dr. Herman has become a Monarchian of the Patripassian type, and can not claim to be a Trinitarian teacher. He gives up not simply "a transcendent metaphysical deity," but also the Son and the Spirit, who can have no meaning and no existence as God.

We hope we have misunderstood Dr. Herman.

In an article in the *Methodist Review* (Nov.) on "The Opportunity of the Church," Professor Oscar Kuhns of

Wesleyan University, laments the pleasure-seeking spirit of the age. He says:

“The world to-day seems to be interested in nothing so much as pleasure and amusement, made possible by the marvellous inventions of the age. It thus comes to pass that foreign travel, automobiles, commercialized athletic sports, theatres, moving picture shows, to say nothing of the hours devoted to business, leave little or no time for what the saints of all the ages have declared to be the very heart of religion—the communion of the soul with its God. The motto of the world to-day seems to be, ‘Let us eat, drink and be merry and forget that to-morrow we die,’ and as Shakespeare makes Autolycus say, in concluding his philosophy of life, ‘And as for the other world, I sleep out the thought of it’; so the mass of mankind to-day seems to be saying, ‘As for the other world, I amuse myself out of the thought of it.’

“Yet, underneath all this, the soul of man hungers and thirsts after the divine. Even the most successful are discontented and unsatisfied. They feel the never-ending truth that not in the material things of life can peace and comfort be found, that in the words of Emerson, ‘In the weary kingdom of time is the canker of care and sorrow; only in the kingdom of thought is immortal hilarity, the Rose of Joy.’

“This heart-hunger, this yearning after the divine, which so many try to drown in the empty pleasure of life, is sought by still others in the contemplation of nature, and in Christian Science and the others of the new cults which are so characteristic of our time.

“Here, then, is the great opportunity of the Church to-day, not to lessen its activity in social reform, philanthropy and a higher civic ideal, but at the same time to make new efforts to satisfy the yearning after God which lies deep down in the heart of multitudes of men and women all about us; to reveal and interpret in new terms that God who is all about is, to show that even to-day He is nigh unto each one of us:

“Closer to us than breathing,
And nearer than hands or feet.”

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

The great war now waging has cleft many a bond. Practically all international ties between the two sides of the giant conflict have been completely severed. When the political relations among the belligerent nations were broken off, all kinds of religious and social relations went the same way.

The very intimacy of their international contact in times of peace seems to have made their hatred the more bitter now that they are at war. No pains are spared to show the fierce animosity of the nations at war. No matter how great the sacrifice in terms of religion and intelligence and humanity, no matter how despicable the means employed, their neighborly hatred is studiously fostered and aggravated to the highest pitch. Torn are the threads of brotherhood and co-operation that had begun to weave hither and thither among the nations of Christendom like hopeful harbingers of the dawn of permanent and universal peace. Ruthlessly shattered are the international social and religious bonds that were constantly increasing in number and in strength and until 1914 were considered almost inviolable. And the awful gulf that yawns between the two sides of the monster struggle permits of no bridging.

Various kinds of organizations that were international in their scope have felt the dissevering edge of the war. The socialistic propaganda, which prided itself upon the fact that it ignored all bounds of nation and of language and united the masses of all lands against the classes of all stands, has found itself powerless to stem the swelling tide of hate among the nations. International socialism has gone down before the bayonet.

Nor has the secret lodge system been able to endure the strain. Free Masonry is known to have a multitude of devotees in each of the nations at war. But thousands of the brothers are fighting with zeal and avidity on both

sides of "no man's land." Masons point their guns against Masons. Last July a German investigator, formerly resident in Rome, published detailed and specific evidence against the Free Masons of Italy implicating them in the outbreak of the war. This evidence seems to have proved, at least to the satisfaction of the religious press in Germany, that it was the long arm of the Free Masons in England and France that reached over into Italy and forced the Italian government to declare war. The Free Masons of Germany have been not a little embarrassed by this activity of their brothers in Italy and have made only feeble efforts to explain it. But the incident shows that even this strong net-work of secret societies has been cut sharply in two by the present war. The incident has also given occasion to a part of the German press to voice its bitter regards for the Free Masons in America and their influence in bringing about the present American alliance with England.

It is a notorious fact that the myriad forces of war have tramped rough-shod over all distinctions of religion. Religious considerations seem to be completely ignored by both sides. Heathen and Christian fight side by side against heathen and Christian. The embattled nations present a beautiful picture of the brotherhood of man, where all distinctions are forgotten and there is neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor barbarian, Roman nor Protestant, but only "with us" and "against us"! But this separation into "pro" and "anti" is so sharp and deep that it too ignores all demands of religion, and the lines of Christian influence that had been stretching across the boundaries of States and weaving to and fro among the enlightened Christian nations have been completely severed by the sharp division. The international organizations of Christian students have been unable to maintain any kind of relations among the warring nations. The Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh World's Missionary Conference has been broken.

The ecclesiastical organizations like the political, the socialistic, the fraternal, the missionary, and the student organizations, have failed to maintain their international

character so far as the two sides of the great war are concerned. The Evangelical Alliance is divided into parts and so has lost its essential character. The strong international organization of Methodists has gone to pieces on the rocks of hate, just as in our own country at the time of the Civil War religious bodies with one accord separated into North and South.

Thus it would seem that no influence has been strong enough to withstand the separating influence that war has let loose among the nations.

And yet, there is one factor, one international bond, that is claimed to have remained intact. This is the General Lutheran Conference. Its international character is not very strongly expressed, it is true, nevertheless it does have such a character. Hence the Lutheran papers of Germany are fond of pointing out the continued integrity of the General Conference, and they are asking the representatives of other denominations to explain the splendid attitude of the Lutherans all over the world in view of the fact that all other evangelical bonds have been broken and all other denominations have failed so completely in their international organizations.

There is the strong Swedish branch of the General Conference, embracing some six millions of Swedish Lutherans. They are steadfastly loyal to their German brethren in this war. When the venerable Leipsic Missionary Society held its annual meetings during the last week in May, Provost Gudmar Hogner was sent as the official representative of the Swedish Lutheran Church. The Provost remarked on that occasion that the Swedes considered it particularly important in these serious times to have an official representative at the German conference, and he continued: "We Swedes can never forget our German origin and our common heritage. We may have given the Germans something, but we have received far more from them. Olaus Petri, the Reformer of Sweden, was a true disciple of Luther, even if he was an independent disciple. That will never be forgotten in Sweden. If, therefore, you are to be called 'barbarians,' then we should like to be such 'barbarians.'" There can

be no doubt about the continued loyalty to the General Conference of the Lutherans of neutral Sweden.

Then there are the Lutheran brethren of Russia, almost equal in number to those in Sweden. Russia is an enemy country and of course there can be no manifestations of sympathy with Germany or the Germans. Nevertheless, the Lutherans in Russia have been able in a silent but real way to show their regard for the Lutherans in Germany. Among the Germans who are prisoners of war in Russia the Lutherans in that country have been unusually active in their ministrations. The brethren in the faith have cared for one another. So great has been the special kindness of Russian Lutherans towards the Germans that in some cases their leaders have been brought to trial and banished to Siberia as criminals. All of which is simply an indication that the pervasive influence of the Lutheran faith stretches across the trenches and battle-lines and makes itself felt with international force even in the Russia of today.

Moreover, the Lutherans in France have given unmistakable evidence that even there the bonds of a common faith with the General Lutheran Conference have not been forgotten. What that evidence is, the German papers are not free to say. But it is characterized as "touching" and "genuine" and it is regarded as real and unmistakable.

Even the Lutherans in America, with their meager two and a half millions, are said to have maintained intact the bonds of brotherly love with their brethren in the faith in the Fatherland. And the Germans as a nation no longer regard America as a neutral country. They regard her as virtually an ally of England and France, morally, financially, and actually, a companion of the enemies of Germany in everything but arms. Yet the Lutherans of Germany are glad to see many indications that the Lutherans of America as a class are kindly disposed towards the cause of the Fatherland in this terrible struggle.

It is claimed in the German papers that the Lutherans in America are the ablest and most zealous opponents of

England's campaign of deception and prevarication as conducted in America. One editor sets forth that the Lutherans are first and foremost in the futile efforts to prevent the export of munitions of war to England and France. It is said that the prayers for the success of the German cause are heard in scarcely any other than Lutheran Churches, and that the great gatherings on behalf of the Teutonic allies are instituted by Lutherans and attended most largely by them. It is a matter of gratification to the Lutherans of the Fatherland that the religious press of the Lutheran Church in America is either prudently silent on the whole matter or else outspoken in its friendliness for the German cause. Everywhere among American Lutherans there are evidences of sympathy and support for the Lutherans in Germany and their missions among the heathen. The Methodist press of America, for example, has been so outspoken in its antagonism to the cause of the Germans that the Methodist pastors of Germany have found themselves greatly embarrassed in the eyes of their fellow-Germans, and they have sent a very emphatic protest to the Methodists of America, pointing out that the cause of German Methodism is suffering serious compromise because of the violent attacks of the American Methodists upon Germany and the Germans. Among Lutherans, on the other hand, there has been not the least interruption of friendly relations, even though individual Lutherans in all lands have failed to recognize the righteousness of Germany's cause in the war. Nowhere has the international character of the General Lutheran Conference been lost or even threatened.

Why, it is asked, should this international Lutheran organization stand out so uniquely in this baleful imbroglio? Why should the Conference of Lutherans be practically the sole survivor of the terrific tempest among the nations? And the answer is thought to be found in the strong constitution of the Lutheran faith and the robust character of her doctrines. The stout vitality of her confession, the constancy of her teaching and practice, that very tenacity of her evangelical faith which has enabled

her in times past to resist the shifting winds of doctrine and the cunning sleight of men whereby they lie in wait to deceive, has once again shown its silent but powerful potency by ignoring the bounds of warring nations and rising upon the arms of a common brotherhood to breast the waves of international passion and hate.

Until the outbreak of this present war some of the more zealous among Protestants were accustomed to say that the Roman Catholic Church is the strongest international organization in the world. And because of the strong representation of that Church in nearly all the cultured nations on earth the advocates of universal peace were inclined to regard her as one of the factors that could be counted on to prevent any such general war as the world is now witnessing. It was hoped that the temporal influence of the Roman pontiff would be strong enough to throw the balances against such a conflagration involving so many millions of his spiritual subjects. But in the fateful summer of 1914 the Pope's voice was soon drowned in the martial din and never since then has it made itself heard with any effect. Millions of Catholics are aligned on each side of the contest. And it is not possible by any distortion of facts or false construction of history to give plausibility to the theory that this war is a war of religion like the Thirty Years' War of the seventeenth century.

Efforts have been made so to represent the matter. But they have failed. Certain clerical sheets of Belgium, of France, and of French Switzerland, have sought to paint the present European war as a war among the religious confessions. They say this war was conceived by the Lutherans and is designed to annihilate the Catholics. Several Protestant papers have therefore gathered and published precise statistics concerning the confessional affiliations of the countries now at war. The totals are interesting.

First, with reference to the Teutonic Allies. According to the official census of 1910 Germany had at that time a population of 64,925,993. Of these the Protestants numbered 39,991,421; and the Catholics, 23,821,453.

That is to say, the Catholics constitute more than one-third of the total population of Germany. Austria-Hungary in that same year had a population of 51,390,223. Of these the Protestants numbered 4,556,500; and the Catholics, 39,305,470. Austria also contained 4,479,646 Greek Orthodox and 2,258,013 Jews. So we see that Germany and Austria together have 44,547,921 Protestants as against 63,126,923 Catholics. Among the Teutonic Allies therefore the Catholics are in a large majority.

On the side of their enemies the figures are approximately the same. In France there are 650,000 Protestants as against 38,000,000 Catholics. In England, not counting the small contingents from Canada, Asia, and Australia, there are 38,000,000 Protestants and 5,500,000 Catholics. In Belgium we have 100,000 Protestants to 7,500,000 Catholics. In Russia there are 7,000,000 Protestants, 11,000,000 Catholics, and 110,000,000 Greek Orthodox. So we see that the enemies of the Central Powers count about 45,000,000 Protestants as against 62,000,000 Catholics. Again the Catholics predominate, and in almost the same proportion as among the Teutonic nations.

There are just about the same number of Catholics on the side of the Germanic Empires (63 millions) as on the side of the Allies (62 millions) and just about the same number of Protestants on the side of the Germans (44 millions) as on the side of their enemies (45 millions). So far as the figures go, therefore, there certainly is no justification for the claim that this is a war of annihilation between Protestants and Catholics.

Two other factors might be considered in making up these statistics, namely, the 35,000,000 Catholics of Italy and the 110,000,000 Greek Orthodox in Russia. But Italy entered the war so long after it began, and her attitude at the beginning was so uncertain, that she could hardly in any case be considered a factor in the religious motives that led to the war, if such motives there had been. The Greek Orthodox, on the other hand, in any measure of religious motives would have to be counted

on the side of the Protestants, because they are non-Catholics and are therefore held to be "heretics" just as truly as the "sectarians." But the overwhelming majority of these Greek Orthodox are on the side of the Entente Allies. If, therefore, this war is to be regarded as a religious war upon Catholics by their religious enemies, the "heretics," the Central Powers would represent the Catholic party defending the Papacy and the Quadruple Entente would represent the anti-Catholic party! And Germany would be branded the leader of the Catholic forces, while France and Italy would be found in the forefront of the enemies of Catholicism! This is simply absurd.

No, there is but one conclusion in the whole matter, namely, that the issues in this war are far removed from the religious sphere. There is neither Catholic nor Protestant, Greek nor barbarian, Jew nor Gentile, black nor white, nor even Christian or heathen, in the war that now convulses the world. The issues that have caused this war are as characteristic of our day as religious issues were characteristic of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. We stand to-day in the midst of the economic and industrial era of the modern age. And the issues to be determined in the present war are economic issues. After they have been fought out the economic world will begin a new life through this baptism of blood and she will then turn her attention to the industrial war.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ABINGDON PRESS, NEW YORK.

John Wesley's Place in History. An address delivered at Wesleyan University on the occasion of the Wesley Bicentennial, by Woodrow Wilson. Cloth. Pp. 48. Price 50 cents net.

This address of President Wilson is a literary gem. The beauty and the aptness of the language are the fit setting of a fine delineation of one of the great men of history. In the brief compass of this essay there is a clear and comprehensive description of the conditions, political, economic, social and religious, which characterized the 18th century. Against this background stands Wesley with the message of God in a most critical period of England's history—a message full of power, because full of conviction. He was a man gifted with rare common sense, good practical judgment and fine executive ability. This was the true type of the evangelist, "poise in spirit, deeply conversant with the natures of his fellow-men, studious of the truth, sober to think, prompt and yet not rash to act, apt to speak without excitement and yet with a keen power of conviction."

This address is a noble tribute from a son of an American manse to one of an English vicarage.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Universe as Pictured in Milton's Paradise Lost. By William Fairfield Warren, Professor in Boston University. Cloth. Pp. 80. Size 6 x 9. Price 75 cents net.

Milton's *Paradise Lost* is a monument to human genius. While its depth and majesty are a bar to popularity, it will always appeal to the thoughtful, and will remain, as it has been for two-and-a-half centuries, the greatest epic in English literature. From the nature of the subject one may expect some obscurity, for it is difficult to catch the exact point of view of the great poet. In order to do this his interpreters have endeavored to discover his idea of the universe, which as a matter of fact was

not that of modern science, and which was no doubt in part the product of his imagination. These interpreters, in their effort to trace the fall of Satan "down

To bottomless perdition, there to dwell

In adamant and penal fire,"

have projected various diagrams by which to support their theories.

The present volume, by an author favorably known for his work on "The Earliest Cosmologies," is an attempt to set forth "the essential features of the universe as pictured in Paradise Lost." Miltonian scholars will no doubt welcome this new study of the immortal epic.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Studies in Recent Adventism. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. Cloth, 16 mo. Pp. 160. Price 50 cents net.

We welcome another of Dr. Sheldon's little treatises on current doctrinal aberrations. The present volume is timely in view of the aggressiveness of certain sects of Adventists, of which perhaps Russelism is the most fanatical and obnoxious. The period covered in the survey extends from the rise of the Millerites in 1831 to the present. Dr. Sheldon brings to his task a calm judicial temper, a thorough knowledge of Church history, the gift of keen analysis, and an evangelical spirit. He states first in an impartial manner the various assumptions and some special teachings of the Adventists, and then shows the utter untenableness of these theories from history, from Scripture and from logic. The pastor will do well to secure this volume with similar ones by Dr. Sheldon on Mormonism and Christian Science. They will furnish him with excellent ammunition with which to resist the insidious invasions of these several perversions of Christian doctrine.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Redemption of the South End. By E. C. E. Dorion. 8 vo. Pp. 124. Illustrated. Bound in cloth. Price \$1.00 net.

This is a fascinating book. It is not only fascinating, but also inspiring. If any one is beset by doubts as to the divine origin of Christianity, or the power of the Gospel to save, or if he is depressed by the apparent failure of the Church in reaching and saving the lost, let him

read this book. It ought to be a sure cure for any such pessimistic conditions of either mind or heart.

It is not a book of fiction, though the title might suggest that. It is a true and sober story of a great work in city missions that has been carried on in the South End of Boston for the past fifty years and more. The subtitle of the volume is "A Study in City Evangelization." The work is conducted under the name of "The Morgan Memorial." Locally it is familiarly known as "The Morgan." This name comes from the man who inaugurated the work before the Civil War. Rev. Henry Morgan was a rather eccentric Methodist minister, evangelist and temperance reformer. He worked largely along independent lines, but he worked well and successfully. He died in 1884, but he had laid broad and deep the foundations for the great work which has been developed since.

"The Morgan Memorial" is now really an institutional church, but of a rather unique character and conducted on a very large scale. Much of the work is done among and for children. This includes a day nursery, kindergartens, play rooms, manual labor, and domestic science schools, instruction in music and art, a regular children's church, &c., &c. But there are also many departments for the rescue and assistance of adults, including a temperance saloon, repair shops, industrial plants of various kinds, and a large department store where the finished products from the various shops are sold at moderate prices, and often at greatly reduced rates, that put them within the reach of even the very poor.

There are also farms, and shops, and summer camps and schools both for children and for adults, conducted in the country. The two dominant notes in all this work are religion and self-support. In every department and at all times religion is given a prominent place. Every effort is made to have all who come in contact with the institution realize that the love of Jesus Christ is the inspiring motive behind everything that is done for them, and that the saving power of Jesus Christ is the only thing that can rescue men from the slavery of sin and vice and restore them to true manhood. At the same time they are required to pay at least something, if they are at all able, for every service rendered. If they have no money they are given work and thus enabled to pay. In this way they are kept from being demoralized and from becoming mere dependents.

The history of this work has its lessons for all Christian workers including pastors in charge of regular congregations. We quote just one paragraph which comes

like a trumpet call to all who are interested in the salvation of souls. "A stranger visiting the religious services of the institution will be impressed with the tremendous earnestness of the workers from a spiritual standpoint. Preacher, singers, helpers, all are bending every effort to one end, and that is, to secure definite results. It is a well-nigh worn-out criticism, yet applicable all too often, that altogether too many religious workers fail at this very point. Preachers have no conversions; but for that matter, they expect none. Morgan Memorial expects, and it receives. It goes out for the unconverted, and it reaches them." Page 32.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Sermons on the Eisenach Gospels. By Rev. J. Sheatsley, pastor of Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church, Columbus, Ohio. 8vo. Bound in half leather. Pp. vii + 579. Price \$2.50.

The Eisenach Gospel and Epistle Selections are evidently growing in favor in this country as well as in Germany. This is not without reason. In many respects they are a decided improvement on the old established Perikopes. The selections seem to be made more naturally and more logically, and they cover a wider range.

For example, take the lessons for the Advent season through which we have just passed. In the old Perikopes the Gospel for the first Sunday in Advent is Matt. 21:1-9. This is the account of our Lord's triumphant entry into Jerusalem at the beginning of Holy Week. It is really a Palm Sunday lesson, and as a matter of fact the same Gospel lesson is used again for Palm Sunday. For the second Sunday in Advent the lesson is Luke 21:25-36 which deals with the second coming of Christ for judgment. The lesson for the third Sunday of Advent is Matt. 11:2-10. This is the story of the inquiry sent to Jesus from prison by John at the hand of two of his disciples, and the answer returned by Jesus to His perplexed forerunner. For the fourth Sunday the lesson is John 1:19-28, which gives us the reply made by John to the deputation sent from Jerusalem to ask him whether or not he claimed to be the Messiah.

Now compare with these the lessons for these same Sundays from the Eisenach Selections. For the first Sunday in Advent we have Luke 1:68-79 which is the Song of Zacharia at the time of the circumcision of

John. For the second Sunday the Gospel is Luke 17:20-30 which treats of the coming of the kingdom of God. For the third Sunday we now have Matt. 3:1-11, which gives us an account of John's ministry and call to repentance. For the fourth Sunday in Advent the lesson is John 1:15-18. This is John's witness to the superior greatness and fulness of Him who was to come after him. This certainly presents a much more fitting approach to and preparation for the glad Christmas season which commemorates the birth of Jesus, the promised Messiah and Savior of the world. It would be easy to point out other similar advantages in favor of these Eisenach Selections.

Then, another thing in favor of the Eisenach series is the larger use which is made of the Gospel of St. John. Some one has said lately that the Gospel of John is the Gospel of the future. Of all the evangelists John certainly gives evidence of the clearest and the deepest insight into the real character and meaning for the Church and the world of the person and the message and the work of Christ. Hence, as the Church develops in Christian experience and in Christian life and insight it will naturally turn more and more to this latest and chiefest of the four biographies of Jesus. The Eisenach Selections take twenty-four lessons from John's Gospel, as against only sixteen in the old Perikopes.

At any rate, even for those who may wish to continue the use of the old Perikopes, these Eisenach Selections will offer a desirable substitute to be used occasionally for the sake of variety and in order to cover in their preaching a wider range of the history and teaching of Jesus as given in the four Gospels.

The growing interest in and increasing use of the Eisenach series are naturally calling out also a growing literature in connection with them. Not to speak of German publications we have had within the last year or two two large volumes from Professor R. C. H. Lenski of Capital University, one on the Gospels and the other on the Epistles. Really there are four volumes bound as two. These are of an exegetical and homiletical character, and offer a vast amount of material and many very valuable suggestions for the assistance of pastors in the use of the Eisenach Selections in their pulpit work.

Now we have this fine volume from the pen of Rev. Sheatsley who is the pastor of one of the leading Joint Synod of Ohio Churches in Columbus. In the brief preface, or "Foreword," he tells us that the sermons contained in it were prepared for publication in compliance

with a request from the Publication Board of his own synod. He also informs us that these sermons are "the fruit of three annual efforts of study and preaching through the entire series." They give evidence all through of this careful preparation.

The sermons are expository in form and are fine examples of this most popular and useful style of preaching. From each lesson the preacher deduces a central theme which gives unity to the discourse as a whole. The divisions and subdivisions are drawn directly from the text, thus giving the sermons somewhat of a textual character. Several examples of this method of treatment may be found interesting. Thus, for the first Sunday in Advent the lesson, as already stated, is Luke 1:68-79. This is the Song of Zacharias, and after a brief introduction this is announced as the central theme of the sermon. In this Song the preacher, by analysis of it, finds, "first, lively expectation; secondly, heartfelt thanksgiving; thirdly, strong faith." For Epiphany the lesson is Matt. 3:13-17. The central theme announced is "Jesus' Manifestation as the Messiah." The three main divisions suggested by the lesson are: 1. The Son's Obedience; 2. The Spirit's Descent; 3. The Testimony of the Father. So we might go on through the volume, but these two examples will give a fair idea of the general treatment homiletically.

The style is throughout interesting, thoughtful and suggestive. Illustrations abound, and they are always well chosen and well applied. The sentences, as a rule, are short and crisp and fairly tingle with life and animation. The practical applications of the truth to present-day life and experience are always kept in view. These sermons will make profitable reading for the members of our churches, and will offer many fruitful suggestions to preachers who may wish to use this Eisenach Series as the basis for a year's sermons in their own pulpits.

We cannot close this review without a word of praise for the publisher for the excellent work which they have put into this volume. The paper, the type and press work, and especially the binding are all that could be desired to make the book attractive to the eye, pleasant to handle, and durable. We have observed an occasional failure in the proof reader, but none that are serious or that would confuse the sense. We hope that Rev. Sheatsley will follow this volume with a similar one on the Eisenach Epistle Selections.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Sermons on the Catechism. Vol. I, The Ten Commandments. By Robert Emory Golladay, pastor Grace Lutheran Church, Columbus, Ohio. 8vo. Cloth. Pp. xii + 426. Price \$1.50.

This volume is a valuable addition to the catechetical literature of our Church in the English language. Though complete in itself it is intended, we understand, to be the first of a series of four volumes on the Smaller Catechism of Luther. As the title indicates, this volume deals with the Ten Commandments. The other volumes, we presume, will take up the succeeding chief parts in regular order, The Creed, The Lord's Prayer, and The Sacraments.

The author is a minister of the Joint Synod of Ohio, and is pastor of one of their most important churches. A fine portrait likeness faces the title page. In a brief Preface we are informed that these sermons were delivered to the congregation of which the author is pastor in response to a request from a large adult Bible class connected with the Sunday School of the congregation that "the subjects treated in our Catechism be again explained from the pulpit." This request was submitted to and approved by the Church Council, or "Vestry," as the author calls it, with the proviso that the sermons should be preached at the morning service. A subsequent request from a number of those who heard them that the sermons might in some way be made available for reading led to their publication.

It is gratifying to read the author's statement that while the attendance at their morning service "is always good and the attention usually all that could be desired, never before did it attain quite the standard reached during the delivery of these sermons." He adds that he finds in this fact "the confirmation of a conviction long entertained that the average congregation, at least the average Lutheran congregation, wants something substantial in the sermons to which it listens; something which appeals to the mind and the heart and impels to action." We believe that this is true, and we hope that it may always remain true.

There is also a brief "Introduction" by Professor C. B. Gohdes of Capital University. In this we have a brief account of Rev. Golladay's life and previous work, and also a general characterization of the sermons in this volume. We quote a paragraph from the latter: "Concerning the timeliness of this book little need be said. It is an exposition of the Law—God's Law. The message

of the Law is needed in our congregations to-day as much as ever. Even where church attendance is gratifying, spiritual life is often on a rather low spiritual and moral plane. The preacher of these sermons strikes straight from the shoulder. Like Paul at Miletus, he can say: 'I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God.' The range of topics treated in these sermons is virtually coextensive with the spiritual needs and duties of our people. Subjects, the vigorous handling of which from the pulpit is likely to result in resentment upon the part of some of the hearers, are boldly dealt with from the standpoint of one who is accustomed to declaring: 'Thus saith the Lord.' "

From our own reading of these sermons we can endorse heartily this estimate of them. They are plain, practical and pointed discussions of the various problems suggested by a careful study of God's Law as we find it summarized in the Ten Commandments. They deal directly and fearlessly with the present-day aspects of these problems. The preacher is not content with rebuking the sins of the ancient Hebrews to whom the Law was first given, or of the nations around them by whose example and influence they were so often led astray. He exposes and denounces the sins which are prevalent to-day right here in America, and he does it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Golladay's style is simple but virile. There is very little of rhetorical ornamentation, and comparatively little of illustration. But the thought is always vigorous and clear, and its presentation impressive and convincing. Very frequently there is genuine eloquence, the eloquence of a soul on fire with the love of truth and righteousness and the hatred of all sin and vice. Not seldom he reminds one of the old Hebrew prophets as he thunders against the idolatry, the profanity, and the Sabbath breaking of the present day, or against the lack of respect for parental authority on the part of the young and the failing sense of parental responsibility on the part of the parents themselves, or against the all too prevalent disregard of the sacredness of life and property, and the shameless violations of the law of chastity and moral purity.

We are sure that a wide reading of this volume by the members of our churches, and by all the people would do much good. It would quicken the thought and awaken the conscience and move the will of many who have been drifting along indifferently because they have not stopped to examine the real moral character of what they are

doing, or to ask whither they are tending. It would expose the presence of sin where it has not been suspected. It would reveal the evil nature, and the base wickedness, and the demoralizing and soul-destroying effects of many things that are done daily in business and in social life without much thought just because their real character and their true effects are not understood or not appreciated.

We would especially commend this volume to pastors as a valuable aid in their work of catechetical instruction. They will find it full of most helpful suggestions.

The first two sermons are of a somewhat general character. The one is on "Our Lutheran Catechism" and gives some account of "Its Origin, Its Purpose, and Its Character." It will increase our respect for this remarkable little book, and our gratitude for its possession by our Church. The second one is on "Our Christian Foundation." It is an earnest plea that our Church may stand fast in its old faith in the integrity of the Holy Scriptures as the true Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice as against all the modern attacks upon it which have undermined or shaken the faith of so many. Both of these sermons are timely and they add greatly to the value of the volume as a whole.

We wish to call attention yet to the "Dedication" of this volume by the author. It is as follows: "To the United American Lutheran Church of the Future; one in its Faith, one in its Confession of its Faith, one in its Evangelical Polity, this volume is Dedicated in Hope." If this hope could be realized what a wonderful thing it would be not only for our own beloved Church but for all the forces of truth and righteousness in this country and on this entire western continent. With the author we believe that it is coming. May God speed the day when hope shall be swallowed up in fruition and faith shall become sight.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Its Biblical and Scientific Basis. By J. A. Hall, D.D. Paper. Pp. 53.

As long as Dr. Hall confines his able discussion of the Lord's Supper to the limits of the Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confessions he correctly and persuasively sets forth the Lutheran doctrine. He shows conclusively that

the undivided Christ, in His theanthropic Person, is present at His table.

The several scientific statements in reference to the nature of matter in a refined form are interesting and permissible. Nevertheless, they are illustrative rather than demonstrative.

It is when Dr. Hall indulges in speculation that we can not follow him with our endorsement. He teaches that Christ's true body is the nourishment of the believer's true body—"the body invisible and indestructible, which dwells already in the present outward body." From this we infer that our spiritual bodies are already present with us in our natural life on earth. To prove this our author quotes Paul's assertion "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." But Paul does not say that these bodies coexist. His whole discourse proves the opposite. The natural is everywhere contrasted with the spiritual. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." In the resurrection the corruptible must put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality. There is nothing in Scripture to lead us to believe that the glorious spiritual body "dwells already in the present outward body." The spiritual body is not a present but a future possession. The theory of the coexistence of the natural and the spiritual bodies is a speculation of Swedenborg, and finds no sanction in evangelical theology, as far as we know.

This theory seems to us to be an intrusion into the Lutheran view of the purpose and the effect of the Lord's Supper, and it to some extent vitiates Dr. Hall's otherwise excellent exposition.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Reformation and its Effects. For Busy People. By C. Hale Sipes, attorney-at-law, Pittsburgh, Pa. Paper. Pp. 35. Price 5 cents; 50 cents a dozen.

This booklet should be circulated by the thousand. In seventy questions and answers expressed in good English the author gives us the gist of the Reformation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Life and Works of Rev. Charles S. Albert, D.D. Edited by Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk, D.D. 12mo. Pp. 443. Price \$1.00 net.

The Publication Society has done well to publish this fine memorial volume. He whose name it bears was

worthy of such remembrance. Dr. Albert was an important and leading figure in the counsels and work of the Church for more than a third of a century. He came to maturity early and his ability was quickly recognized.

As President of the Board of Home Missions from 1883 to 1899 he had a large share in determining and carrying out the aggressive policies and wise administration of that work which resulted in such a wide expansion of our Home Mission work and the building up of so many new and strong churches in the great cities, such as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Chicago, &c.

As a frequent delegate to the General Synod and its President from 1893 to 1895, and as a member of many important committees, especially the Committee on the Common Service, he had much to do in shaping the legislation of the General Synod during a very important part of its history, and in encouraging and fostering the return of the body to a stronger Lutheran consciousness and a more general use of our historical forms of worship and methods of work.

As the first literary editor of the Board of Publication, and serving in this capacity from 1893 to the time of his death, a period of nearly twenty years, he did much towards the development of a more adequate denominational literature, especially for the use of our Sunday Schools and for our children and young people.

In all these important positions, and in the many other offices of administration or service which he filled from time to time, he always showed those qualities of practical wisdom, executive skill, business acumen, consideration for others and loyalty to the doctrines and cultus of the Lutheran Church that were such marked characteristics of the man, and that made him such a valuable member of any board or committee, or other deliberative or administrative body with which he might happen to be connected. In these, and in many other things, he had few peers, and we believe no superiors, in our Church during his time.

It would have been a great misfortune, indeed, to have permitted such a life to go out like a snuffed candle leaving behind it nothing but a fading memory of the place it once filled and the light it once gave out so generously. It is true that most of the contents of this volume existed before in the shape of fugitive publications, editorials in the *Augsburg Teacher*, contributions to the Church papers or to the various periodicals of which he was the general editor. But in that form they were not easy of access, and would soon have been lost sight of and forgot-

ten. In this fine volume we have them in a shape in which they can be turned to easily and often, as we are sure they will be not only by the many men and women in the Church who knew Dr. Albert personally as pastor and friend and co-worker, but also by that much wider and larger circle composed of those who knew him only as the editor of our Sunday School literature, and through his writings and his other work for the Church.

The volume is divided into four general parts: I. The Life of Rev. Charles S. Albert, D.D. II. Sermons and Papers. III. Articles on the Work of the Sunday School. IV. Articles on General Religious Themes.

The first of these, written by Rev. Edward Heyl Delk, D.D., is much the shortest, covering only fifteen pages. We are not sure that this is not a mistake. We believe that a character and life such as those of Dr. Albert deserved and should have had more extensive treatment. We believe that the purchasers and readers of this volume would have been glad to know more about him. We believe also that such a fuller account of his life and work would have been most instructive and inspiring. The biographies of good and useful men are one of the most precious possessions of the Church, and of society. They are among the most valuable books that can be put into the hands of the people, especially of the young. We need more of them and here was a fruitful and worthy subject.

The work of the biographer is well done, as far as it goes. It is discriminating, sympathetic and interesting. Dr. Delk had exceptional facilities for knowing his subject well and intimately, especially during the last twelve or fifteen years of his life. We do not see how he could have done the work better within the small compass allowed to him.

To one sentence, however, we are disposed to file at least a mild *caveat*. On page twenty we read: "He still found time to do general reading and some technical study of the new, scholarly Biblical literature which had appeared since his seminary days. That an impression was made by the critical writers of the English and German schools was apparent in his conversation, but in his public utterances and written articles he was content to restate and illuminate with his catholic spirit the conclusions of the older school of writers in theology." From a long and somewhat intimate acquaintance with Dr. Albert, and judging from the knowledge of his clearness of thought, his depth of conviction and his loyalty to the truth thus gained, we are inclined to believe that his con-

tinuance to speak publicly and to write in harmony with "the conclusions of the older school of writers in theology" was the result of his unshaken belief that the old was truer and better than the new.

The title of the second part, "Sermons and Papers," seems to us somewhat misleading, inasmuch as it does not contain a single sermon properly speaking. The only one making any just claim to such a title at all is the one delivered at the opening of the General Synod at Hagerstown in 1895. But this was more of an address than a sermon in the generally accepted meaning of that term. It is not even preceded by a text, though after the somewhat extended historical introduction there is a reference to the words of our Lord, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill," as the basis of his further discourse.

The address itself, or the sermon, if we are to call it such, is a strong one and a very suggestive one. It is a clear and convincing plea for the recognition in the development of the life and work of the Church of the two complementary principles of conversation and of progress. Or, as Dr. Albert himself states them, following the suggestion of the text: "First, a profound study and reverence for the old which is drawn out of the word of God," and "second, fulfillment means the unfolding of the old."

It is well to have this sermon, or address, in this more permanent and accessible form. The two principles referred to and so well stated and defended by Dr. Albert, are both necessary to the true healthy life and development of the Church. While they might seem at first to be antagonistic to each other, they are not necessarily so. They are truly complimentary. Unfortunately, however, the friends of either one of them are too often disposed to over-emphasize it to the neglect or the entire destruction of the other one. Hence we have on the one hand a hard and mechanical orthodoxy which knows no progress and will brook no change or variation even in the statement of truth, and on the other hand a rampant and unregulated radicalism which is disposed to break away from all historical dependence on or connection with the past, and to run off into the wildest and most dangerous vagaries of belief and of practice.

Dr. Albert's address is not only a defense of both of these principles but an attempt to show that, to quote his own words, "The General Synod, rightly apprehended, stands for the truth which includes both. It does not destroy, but, in large development, it would fulfill. The

past is precious, but the past must be transmuted into the living present, in which every doctrine of our beloved Church is understood with reference to present life, and fulfilled by being used in the unfolding of Christ to the believer and sinner."

Much as we value this sermon, therefore, we still regret that this volume has no sermons such as Dr. Albert was accustomed to preach to his own people in his regular pulpit ministrations. We are sure that this regret will be shared by all those who sat under his preaching with so much pleasure and profit in his several pastorates in Lancaster, Carlisle and Baltimore. The reasons for this lack are no doubt to be found in what his biographer says of his methods of preparation for the pulpit. In his later life he seldom if ever wrote his sermons in full, either before or after preaching, and we suspect that he himself had destroyed most of the results of his earlier work in making sermons. But while this may explain the absence of any other sermons, it does not lessen our keen regret because of it.

We think, however, that it would have added much to the interest and value of this second part of the volume if the editors had indicated the occasion, or the circumstances and the date, in connection with which all the addresses or papers were prepared and delivered, as they have done with two of them.

The third and fourth parts are made up of shorter papers, or contributions, on the work of the Sunday School and on general religious themes. Probably a large proportion of these appeared originally as editorials in the *Augsburg Teacher*, or as contributions to the other periodicals of which Dr. Albert was editor or for which he frequently wrote.

They are all marked by those qualities which were such outstanding characteristics of all Dr. Albert's writing and speaking, such as intense earnestness, depth of spiritual insight, clearness of thought, vigor of expression, simplicity of language, richness of illustration, apt quotations, &c. As Dr. Wiles says in his brief but appreciative preface to the volume: "For elegance of diction, simplicity of style, depth of spiritual insight and power of illustration, our Church may have had his equal but never his superior."

A most excellent and lifelike picture of Dr. Albert faces the title page of the volume, which will greatly add to the value of the book for all his friends. Underneath it is a faithful reproduction of his autograph which will also be appreciated by his many friends.

We trust that this volume will have a large sale in the Church, both because of its inherent worth, and also to encourage our Publication Society to enrich the literature of the Church by many additional volumes of a similar character.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. 150 5TH AVE., N. Y.

Paul and His Epistles. By D. A. Hayes, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute. Crown 8vo. Pp. 508. Price \$2.00 net.

This is not a commentary as might be supposed from the title. It is really a book on New Testament Introduction, one of a series on "Biblical Introduction" being published by the Methodist Book Concern. In many respects it is better than a commentary, as it gives the reader a background of biography, history and other facts, which enables him to do his own work in exegesis and explanation.

It is in every respect a most vital and vitalizing book. The style is full of life and spirit. The author knows his subject thoroughly and writes always with a firm hand, and with a convincing array of facts and arguments. We can very heartily endorse what the publishers themselves say of the volume: "It is a vivid and vital portrayal of the Pauline era. The author has visualized persons and places. As one reads he realizes that he is in touch with living men, actual churches and congregations, and with events that thrill and throb with life. The towering figure of Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles dominates the scene, and the spiritual power of the Apostles and early Christians is written on every page. To the minister or layman who reads this volume the New Testament era can never again be academic or vague. It must ever remain intensely human, real and concrete."

The volume is divided into fourteen chapters, preceded by a "Foreword" of eight pages in which the author gives a general statement of his purpose in writing the book, and his method of treatment. The first chapter is devoted to a kind of biographical sketch of the Apostle himself, considered under three general topics, "I. Personal Preparation," "II, Personal Appearance," "III, Personal Characteristics." Under these three heads the author discusses about every question that could possibly be raised concerning the Apostle of a personal character.

It may be interesting to see what he has to say on several of these.

On his personal appearance we find this on page 46, "How, then, shall we picture to ourselves the Paul who wrote these epistles? A short, almost dwarfish looking man, with a bald head and a long gray beard; a little stooped and with eyes rather weakened by much reading and constant exposure to the fierce Oriental sun; subject to a physical infirmity which most men would have considered a sufficient excuse for incapacity but which he made only an incentive to greater spiritual strengthening; swarthy, full of energy, full of grace!"

Of Paul's conversion he says, (page 27), "The greatest event in the history of the human race was the birth of Jesus. The greatest event in the life of Jesus was his resurrection from the dead. After these two moments of primary importance in the history of the human race and of the Christian Church, the next most momentous occurrence in their history was the conversion of Paul. Jesus founded the faith, but Paul was to be the apostle of its universal conquest. The other apostles had no such experience of conversion as Paul underwent on the road to Damascus. * * The conversion of Paul was a capital event in world history. It was something new in the apostolic ranks. A new era in Christendom had dawned with Paul's new birth."

Of the meaning of Paul's sojourn in Arabia he has this to say, "What did Paul do in Arabia? He prepared himself for his future ministry. He studied the Scriptures and waited upon God. He formulated his theology. He reasoned it all out. His system of thought was complete before he began to preach. Too many men go into the ministry to-day who are not clear upon many points of doctrine. They do not know what they believe concerning them. They begin to preach and hope that in time the obscurities in their faith will clear away or that they can succeed in concealing their doubts from their people. It was not so with Paul. He knew what he believed from the beginning to the end of his ministry. He was as clear as crystal in all the fundamentals of his religious thought when he came out of Arabia. There never was any doubt or uncertainty in his preaching after that. We question whether there was any considerable development of doctrine in any of the essentials of his creed from first to last. He had thought it all out before he began to preach it to others."

Some ten pages are devoted to the discussion of the question of Paul's health, and especially of the real char-

acter or nature of that "thorn in the flesh" to which he refers so pathetically in his second letter to the Corinthians. As to the latter the author presents the many theories that have been held, with the reasons given in support of each. For himself, he holds that we may gather certain facts from the several epistles, such as that this "thorn" was "some sort of an agonizing bodily pain," that "it was recurrent or intermittent," that possibly it was "an accompaniment or a result of certain ecstatic experiences," that there were "certain residual effects of this suffering, such as weakness and mental depression," that "there was something objectively repulsive about this disease" because it seems to have presented to the Galatians a temptation "to despise Paul and to reject him and his message." As the result of the whole discussion he reaches two conclusions, "First, that we are not likely to reach any certainty in the matter at this late day. If the facts were at all clear, there would have been more general agreement. Second, while the exact nature of the malady may be undetermined, almost all would agree that Paul was subject to some physical infirmity which he esteemed a great handicap but for the endurance of which he had sufficient grace, and in spite of which he did his marvelous work with unabating zeal and unflagging energy."

We cannot resist the temptation to make just one more quotation from the "Summary" at the close of this chapter on the Apostle himself. "He may have been feeble with fever at times, or he may have suffered with some chronic complaint, or he may have been subject to recurrent attacks, but nevertheless he must have had a physical fiber in him which was capable of most extraordinary endurance. As a mere physical achievement his life-work seldom has been equalled among men. The secret of his career is to be found in his indomitable soul and his complete consecration. Difficulties might multiply, friends might dissuade, everything might seem to be in opposition, and yet when Paul saw his duty clearly set before him he went straight forward without swerving.

"He had something of the serene indifference to all consequences involved in his obedience to the law of his Lord which is characteristic of the ocean tides and the stellar courses.* * Paul attained a 'mighty life' because he was a man of mighty powers concentrated upon a single aim. That aim was the conversion of men to the practice of the holy life consequent upon a genuine faith in his risen and triumphant Lord. That made him the world's greatest missionary."

The second chapter is devoted to a general discussion of "The Epistles" in which the three leading topics are, first, their "Form," secondly, their "Style," and thirdly, their "Value." There are many passages in this chapter also, as indeed there are all through the book, which are very quotable, and which one is strongly tempted to quote. We confine ourselves, however, to one single selection which will give the flavor of the whole, and which deals with one of the "burning questions" of the day in theology, the relation of the theology of Paul to the teaching of Jesus. On this point our author says, "For almost half a century now a great controversy has been raging over the authority of the apostle Paul. The cry has been raised: 'Back to Christ! Paul has misled us. There is a great difference between Christ's teaching and Paul's preaching.' * *

"The assumption of a difference in the essentials of the teaching of Jesus and of Paul is unfounded and unproven and untrue. We have not two discordant gospels in the New Testament. We have but one gospel. The gospel of Jesus is the gospel of Paul. * *

"There is a difference between the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of Paul. That is apparent to all, and no one denies it. The difference, however, is only one of degree and not of kind. Jesus never formulated His principles into a system. * * He enunciated germinal principles.* * He never intimates that His teaching is complete. On the contrary, he said to His disciples that He had many things to tell them for which they were not yet prepared, and He promised them the Spirit's coming, that He might guide them into the further truth. Were these promises of additional revelations never fulfilled? We think they were in the case of Paul and the other New Testament writers. They took the germinal ideas of Jesus and gave them fuller development.* *

"The only way to get back to Christ is through the epistles of Paul. The best equipment for anyone who desires to present Christian truth to-day is the mastery of the gospel of the apostle Paul. * * The teachings of Paul are the teachings of Jesus more fully developed and more fully revealed. That is the relation between the two. We agree with Kaftan in saying that * * the greatest hours in the spiritual history of Christianity have been those in which Paul became a living power in the Church, and it is not likely that to-day a new epoch will be introduced through exactly the opposite, the relegating of Paul to the lumber-room of theology."

It is difficult to stop where all is so good. But our limited space forbids further quotation. We can only hope that this taste of what the book has to offer will induce many of our readers to procure it and read it through. We are sure that they will find themselves well repaid.

The next eleven chapters take up the several epistles for separate study, and are filled with information and suggestions that throw an illuminating light on the occasion which called each of them forth, their contents and the conditions and circumstances with which they dealt, and also on their practical uses for believers and the churches of the present day. We regret that we cannot enter more fully into the details of these rich and helpful discussions. The final chapter consists of "A Closing Word," which is a brief review of the whole course of thought followed through the volume.

There is also an exhaustive "Bibliography" embracing more than two hundred titles, the more important ones being marked with a star. This is followed by an "Index of Subjects," an "Index of Scripture passages" referred to, and an "Index of Names" of authors quoted or referred to. The volume is gotten up in the highest style of the printer's art, is well bound, and there seems to be nothing lacking to make it in every way a most valuable and desirable addition to the library of every minister, and of every intelligent and thoughtful student of the Bible.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

RICHARD G. BADGER. BOSTON.

Religious Education, and the Healing of the Church. By W. A. Lambert. 12mo. Pp. 39. Price 75 cents net.

This little volume is one of a series being published under the general title: "Badger's Library of Religious Thought." As indicated by the title it consists of two papers, or studies, which have only a very broad and general connection. The first paper deals with the subject of religious education both in the Church and in the schools. It insists on the necessity for this education because the child is a unit, and this unit must not be broken up by developing and training it on the physical and the intellectual side while utterly neglecting the moral and spiritual elements in the unit. The paper presents the problem, and seeks to emphasize its importance. It also discusses some of the difficulties which stand in the way

but does not offer any definite solution. It is a thoughtful discussion, but is suggestive rather than decisive. It is evidently intended only to be a step towards a solution.

The second paper deals with the causes and evils of denominationalism, or sectarianism, the essence of which is the claim made by each denomination or sect that it alone has the truth and is the Church, or the kingdom of God. The remedy is to be found in mutual respect and mutual toleration. "The recognition that no Church is the kingdom of God, but that all are of the kingdom, this is the great truth which each needs to learn, that all may grow to be one in purpose, although divided in methods and in organization." "Then the Churches can continue in their separate existence, and yet be mutually helpful and co-operative."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Trends of Thought and Christian Truth. By Dr. John A. W. Haas, President of Muhlenburg College, Professor of Religion and Philosophy. Cloth, 5 x 7½. Pp. 329. Price \$1.50 net.

As indicated in the title, *Trends of Thought and Christian Truth*, Dr. Haas sets forth a comparison between the leading modes of modern thought and the orthodox Christian teaching. His purpose is to show that there is no antagonism between really scientific apprehensions of truth and proper religious conceptions thereof. He believes that the Christian faith justifies itself at the bar of reason, while at the same time it transcends all mere philosophies, being supernatural. The leading trends of modern thought are grouped under eight general heads: Mathematical, Inductive, Comparative, Conjectural, Mechanical, Biological, Psychological, and Social. Each of these trends is critically examined within the limits of the volume, and the result is a faithful and discriminating summary of these respective trends. Whatever truths are expressed in these systems, they are freely acknowledged, while at the same time their defects and deficiencies are faithfully pointed out. There is no scorn nor sarcasm in the author's characterization of error. His weapon is truth and his manner is dignified.

In his analysis of the philosophy of Bergson, Dr. Haas discovers that he has no place for "a free, creative, personal God" and that "the God of Bergson cannot be the God of the Christian." In like manner the author finds that Eucken, while recognizing the greatness of Jesus, "does not want him as divine Savior, not even, on a

liberal basis as Lord and Master."

Dr. Haas has given us a hand-book to which one may turn to refresh his memory concerning trends of thought and to find a ready answer to the seductive and delusive half truths which oppose themselves to the truth of the Christian belief.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

My Church. An illustrated Lutheran Manual, pertaining principally to the history, work and spirit of the Augustana Synod. Vol. I, edited by Ira O. Nothstein, of Rock Island, Ill. Pp. 128. Cloth. 60 cents net; Art cover 25 cents net.

This handsomely illustrated book is fully described in the title. It gives glimpses of some of the noted men of the great Swedish Synod, and of its early struggles and its present prosperity. The manual ought to have a wide circulation.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO, ILL.

Pneumatology or the Doctrine of the Work of the Holy Spirit. Outline notes based on Luthardt and Krauth. By Revere F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill. Cloth. Pp. vii, 212. Price \$1.00.

This volume is the latest from the pen of the lamented Dr. Weidner. It corresponds in general appearance and contents with the several theological volumes published by Dr. Weidner during the last twenty years. It treats not so much of the Person of the Holy Spirit, as of His work in the application of redemption. It is rich in its suggestions and discussions. The portion which treats of infant faith will probably not be endorsed by many of its readers. We doubt whether it is correct to say that "the justification of infant baptism remains without evasion conditioned by the question whether infants can believe." (p. 73). This does not seem to be in harmony with the subsequent statement (p. 76) that "the substantial completeness of the sacrament of baptism is in no case dependent on the faith of the believer." Of course as an objective means of grace baptism receives its sanction solely from its divine appointment; nevertheless it

is true, as Luther says, baptism without faith is of no effect.

In quoting Martensen (p. 79) as teaching his view of infant baptism and infant faith, the author is in error. In his *Christian Dogmatics* Martensen says "Personal regeneration cannot be accomplished without a free effort upon the part of the person himself" (p. 427). He says also that the Church "baptizes children wherever mother churches are established, and Christian influence can lead the children on to faith" (p. 430).

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Five-Fold Pathway. By Walter Krumweide, B.D.
Paper Booklet. Pp. 61. Price 10 cents.

This booklet contains a devotional study of Isaiah 52:13—53:12, and is a Lenten Meditation which is profitable to read.

The Efficient Congregation. By J. R. E. Hunt. Tract.
Pp. 28. Price 5 cents.

This booklet contains fifty-four questions and answers concerning Church Efficiency. It touches every part of congregational life. Its wide circulation will do much good.

YEAR BOOKS.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book, 1916. Compiled by Grace M. Sheeleigh, published by the Lutheran Publication Society, 1424 Arch St., Phila., Pa. Paper. Pp. 140. Size 6¼ x 8½. Price by mail 15 cents.

The Year Book is larger and better than ever, containing the Almanac for the year, a list of all Lutheran ministers in the U.S., Canada and the missionaries of American Synods in foreign lands, numerous tables concerning institutions, publications, charities, &c., &c. This is an invaluable mine of information for all Lutherans.

The Methodist Year Book, 1916. Edited by O. S. Bartel and published by The Methodist Book Concern, N. Y. Paper. Pp. 244. Price by mail 25 cents.

This Year Book does not contain the names and addresses of the ministry, but is filled with information about the Methodist Church and its great work.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1916.

ARTICLE I.

HOW CAN A THEOLOGICAL STUDENT GET THE MOST AND THE BEST OUT OF HIS SEMINARY COURSE?¹

BY REV. JACOB A. CLUTZ, D.D.

Professor of Practical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

This is a question which, it may be presumed, is in the mind of every young man who enters a theological seminary to prepare for the work of the Gospel ministry. If it is not, it certainly should be. The question may not always be clearly and definitely formulated in the student's mind. It is possible that it may not always be a matter of clear and definite consciousness. But even if it is not, if he is at all serious-minded and earnest-hearted it will so permeate his subconscious life that the moment it is suggested to him, it will meet with a quick and hearty response and he will say, "Why yes, of course, that is exactly my thought. That is just what I want to know."

In trying to help you to answer this question, in so far as it can be answered in advance, and by another, I wish to emphasize three things which seem to be to be vital. Of

¹ An address delivered at the opening of the Seminary, September 21st, 1915.

course these three things may not cover the whole ground. They may not give the complete answer to our question. No man could be expected, no sensible man would either hope or attempt to answer such a question fully and exhaustively in a single lecture, or address. But I do believe that these are among the most important things, and that they are, at least in some measure, inclusive of all others.

I. *A Worthy Conception of the Office and Work of the Christian Ministry.*

A man must know what he is to do, if he is to prepare himself worthily to do it well. If he is to be only a digger of ditches, or a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for some one else, he will need very little training for the work. All that will be necessary will be for him to go to work, and what little skill is required will very soon be gained by practice. But if he is to run a locomotive, or sail a ship, or manage a railroad, or command an army, or rule a nation, he is likely to need much preliminary instruction, and long training, properly to fit him for the discharge of his duties.

So of the ministry. If we think of the minister simply as a man who is to shine in society, to be an ornament and to play the agreeable at ladies' afternoon teas or at evening parties; or if we think of him as a man who is to be up in gymnastics and athletics, and to ingratiate himself with the young people by being an enthusiastic baseball fan or a noisy rooter at football, or by the facility with which he can reel off all the latest slang of the diamond or the gridiron, or by the skill with which he can play the game himself; or if, to rise a little higher, we think of him simply as a functionary who is to perform certain religious rites and ceremonies and to administer the sacraments, or to deliver pleasant little homilies on moral and religious themes, or on the latest popular novel or the topics of the day; if our conception of the minister is anything like this, then his preparation for his work may also seem to be a very simple thing, and to require neither very much time nor any great care or effort. Almost any young man who is fairly good looking, has a

good voice and a glib tongue, and some measure of social culture, may be regarded as quite well qualified to take up the work and reasonably sure of making a success of it.

But I feel assured that you will all agree with me that such a conception of the ministry is very inadequate and unworthy, though I am not so sure that it is entirely uncommon either in the popular mind, or even in the minds of some candidates for the ministry.

I have no sympathy whatever with the extravagant glorification of the office and work of the ministry which we so often hear from the lips of ministers themselves. It always seems to me to be a matter of questionable taste, and of very doubtful propriety and expediency, for ministers themselves to ring the changes, as they so often do, on the fact that their office and work are the highest and the greatest to which any man can ever be called or chosen, and to make invidious comparisons between the ministry and the legal or the medical profession, or any other vocation or business to which men can give themselves and their time and talents. It may well be that the man who digs a ditch, or builds a house, or cultivates a farm, or runs a store or factory, or heals the sick, or labors to promote wise and just legislation and the fair and equal administration of justice in the courts, if that is the work to which he is divinely appointed, and if he does his work as well as he can, may be just as honorable in the sight of God, and may finally have just as rich a reward, as the minister who preaches the Gospel and seeks to save men from sin and death because that is the work to which God has called him.

At the same time, it is well that as ministers we should magnify our office as Paul did, and as other great and good preachers have done in all ages, not for our own glorification, but that we may tremble under the tremendous weight of responsibility laid upon us, and may stand in awe, with heads uncovered and feet unshod, when God meets us in some great and never-to-be-forgotten experience and bids us to go and preach the Gospel of his Son to a lost world.

The minister is in a special and peculiar sense a man

called of God and set apart for a special work, a high and holy work. He is to be a prophet of Jehovah who is to live in close communion and intimate fellowship with the most High. On the one hand, he is ever to keep his ears open to hear God's voice speaking to him, and through him to the people to whom he ministers. On the other hand, he is ever to be ready to deliver his "thus saith the Lord" without fear or favor, and with such unction and power that men will be constrained to hear it whether they heed it or not. He is to be a priest who is to serve at the altar of the congregation, leading them in their worship, and administering to them the holy sacraments. He is to be a pastor going in and out of the homes of the people and ministering to them there in joy and in sorrow, in sickness and suffering, in adversity, in bereavement and in death, always seeking to apply the truth in the most helpful way to each individual soul in each individual experience. In these days also, whether wisely or not, he is expected to be a man of affairs, a leader and administrator, an organizer and director of societies and organizations, who must at least keep his eye and his hand on a great multitude of social and religious activities of many different kinds, both in his own congregation and in the Church at large. He is expected also to be a wise counsellor and a fearless and enthusiastic leader or helper in all moral, social and civic reforms, and in every kind of movement that looks to the improvement of society, the better adjustment of the relations between capital and labor, the adoption of fairer and more equitable methods in the conduct of business, the more equal distribution of wealth, the more speedy and more righteous administration of law, &c., &c.

When we remember all this, and much more that might be said in the same line if there were time, then we must come to feel that the office of the ministry is really one of the highest and holiest, and the work of the ministry really one of the greatest and most difficult tasks, to which men ever are or ever can be called. We must come to see also that only the very best men, in every sense of the word, are fitted to undertake it. Especially

must we come to realize that the work of preparing for the ministry must be correspondingly difficult and serious, and that any young man may well pause, as he comes to enter the theological seminary, and ask himself seriously, and thoughtfully, and prayerfully, how he can make the very best use and get the most out of the three short years that he is to spend there.

This brings us to the second thing which I wish to emphasize as helpful in answering this question. It is

II. *A Rightful Understanding of the Nature and Function of the Theological Seminary.*

I regard this point as of special importance because I feel that there has been, and is, much misunderstanding in reference to it, not only in the minds of students, but also in the mind of the general public and even of the Church itself. Hence there has been, and is, much unwise and unjust criticism of these schools of the prophets and of the work done in them, as well as of the product turned out of them. They have been called medieval, old-fogy, unpracticable, &c. The work has been said to be weak and poorly done. It has been pronounced lacking in scholarship and thoroughness. The men who go out of them to preach, it is often claimed, are either weak and incompetent, or stilted and unnatural, poor speakers, poor pastors, poor mixers, out of touch with every-day life, unbusinesslike in methods, unable to hold down their jobs, general incompetents and failures, &c.

No doubt some of this criticism is deserved. Where there is so much smoke, there is sure to be some fire, though the fire may not be in any fair proportion to the smoke. The fact is that usually the more smoke there is the less fire will be found. I have discovered that a very little fire covered over and smothered by a great mass of rubbish, will make a much greater smoke than a large blaze burning freely. It is often so with criticism.

But, in some seminaries the courses of study and the methods of work may be somewhat antiquated. They may not have kept pace with the advances made in other educational institutions. There may be a too great reluctance in accepting new truth, or new forms of stating

the old truths, or in letting go the outworn and discredited beliefs and dogmas of the past. There may be a stubborn unwillingness to follow the lead of a noisy, and boastful, and arrogant self-styled modern scientific scholarship that would discredit all the achievements of the past, or to adopt at once all the new-fangled methods of teaching and working invented and advocated by the educational faddists. Too much of the student's time may be spent in acquiring, or in a vain and futile effort to impart to him, a working knowledge of the dead languages in which the Scriptures were originally written. Too much stress may be laid on mere text-book study and recitations. Too little effort may be devoted, and this not always wisely, to training the young men in the art of public speaking, so that they may be able not only to prepare good sermons but also to deliver them acceptably and effectively. There may be a lack of instruction and training in practical affairs, in the administrative work of the Church so much of which now falls to the lot of the pastor in the average congregation, especially in the cities and the larger towns.

All this, I say, may be true. Seminaries are human institutions as are all the institutions of the Church as well as of the State. It would be folly to claim a perfection here which is found nowhere else in the world. Seminary faculties also are made up of fallible men, who are too modest and too sensible to make any claims either to universal knowledge, or to inerrancy in methods.

But, granting all this, there are, on the other hand, some other things also that are true and that must not be lost sight of. One of them is that old things are not to be discarded simply because they are old, neither are new things to be accepted simply because they are new. This is too often the fashion with educators, as well as with society belles and beaus. Very often the old is better than the new. It may be a good thing therefore, I believe that it is a good thing, that our seminaries should be somewhat conservative about making changes in their curriculums, or taking up with all the fads of modern pedagogy, and the so-called university methods. Many

of these have not been sufficiently tested, as yet, to know whether they are wise or not. Let them be thoroughly tried out and proved elsewhere before they are adopted in the seminary. The seminary is no place for experiments, it has too serious a work to do. It may turn out in the future, as it has so often done in the past, that time and experience will condemn the new and vindicate the wisdom and efficiency of the old.

The same thing is true of much of the so-called modern, or new and advanced thought. It may indeed be new, but it is not always advanced by any means. Much of what parades under this high-sounding and honorable name is nothing more than the hasty generalizations or the immature conclusions of conceited young Doctors of Philosophy, or ambitious Doctors of Divinity, who know very well that the best way to attract attention to themselves and to leap into at least a temporary notoriety is loudly to proclaim some startling scientific, or philosophical, or theological novelty, or fiercely to attack some old and cherished belief of the schools or the Church. Often such views win a measure of support at first, and gain a temporary vogue, only to be entirely discredited by more careful investigation, and to go into the great discard where sleep the false teachings of so many past generations. Not infrequently they are only a revival, perhaps under a new name, of teachings that have been discarded long ago.

What a sad mistake it would be for our theological seminaries to be too ready to accept, and to teach, all these vagaries of thought and speculation as they come and go, or even to take the time and the pains to discuss and to disprove them. Time and experience are the best tests of new theories and doctrines. If they survive the generation which gives them birth there is likely to be some truth in them, and then it will be time enough to take them seriously and to examine their credentials. Meanwhile, is it not much wiser and better to hold fast to the old truths and the sound doctrines which have stood the test of the centuries, and on which many generations

have builded their faith and their hopes and have not been disappointed?

Moreover, it must ever be remembered, as over against some of the other criticisms referred to, that our seminaries have to do with men and not with machines, with rational minds and living spirits and not with dead matter. Hence not too much must be expected of them. Due allowance must be made for the personality and the individuality of the students themselves. In a factory where watches or clocks are made, or sewing machines, or printing presses or automobiles, it may be possible to turn out a thousand, or ten thousand, or a hundred thousand, all exactly alike and every one a perfect specimen of its kind. But this is impossible in a school of any grade or character, no matter how well it may be organized or how up-to-date it may be in its faculty and in its equipment and its methods. It is impossible even in the public schools, though it is often attempted there and sometimes the teachers seem to be expected to accomplish it. It is still more impossible in the higher schools, and especially in the professional schools, since the older and the more advanced the students, the more pronounced and fixed are their individual idiosyncracies, and the more difficult it is to change them or to mould them after the same pattern, or to an ideal perfection, even if that were desirable.

The theological seminaries do as good work, I am sure, as any other professional schools. The facts would probably show that they do much better work. Certainly a larger per cent. of the graduates of theological seminaries enter the ministry and are fairly successful in it, than is true of the graduates of any other class of technical or professional schools with reference to the special lines of work for which they have been trained. Of the graduates of the average school of law or of medicine it will generally be found that from 30 to 60 per cent. of them have dropped out of the profession entirely within five or ten years after graduation, or are occupying mere subordinate positions as office clerks or assistants to their more successful competitors. Of the graduates of our seminaries only one now and then fails to enter the ministry and

to continue in it during his active life. When there is such a failure, it is nearly always quite evident that it is not the fault of the seminary, but of the young man himself. Either he did not have in him the stuff out of which a successful minister can be made, or he did not apply himself to his work, or, like Demas of old, he "loved this present world" and therefore has forsaken the preaching of the Gospel for some other more congenial and more remunerative employment.

Sometimes it is said, also, that when young men leave the seminary and enter the actual work of the ministry, they must first unlearn much of what they have been taught, before they can really begin to do their work comfortably and successfully. This, however, is not truer than many of the other criticisms that have been referred to. A young man may misunderstand much of the teaching of his professors, and he may need to correct these misunderstandings. He may draw false inferences from what he is taught, and he may need to correct these inferences. Many students are inattentive and careless. Some are dull and slow. Some will not work. I once heard an old teacher, who had spent many years in the class room in various kinds of institutions of higher education, academies, colleges and universities, and who was universally regarded as an exceptionally well qualified and successful teacher, say that he always considered himself very fortunate if he found one really good student out of ten in his classes. Surely neither the professors nor the seminary should be held responsible for these delinquencies of the students themselves. If a student has done his work faithfully in the school, the chief thing he will have to learn when he leaves it will be to translate theory into practice and to use skillfully and effectively the tools which have been placed in his hands. This, however, grows out of the very nature of the case. The seminary is not to be censured for this any more than the parent bird is to be blamed because its young must learn to fly after they leave the nest.

In many technical and professional schools an effort has been made to overcome this difficulty, at least in part,

by the introduction of laboratory methods of work. The student is expected to test for himself, and to prove or disprove by his own experimentation, the truth of the instruction which is given to him. This is quite possible in many cases, especially when the matters dealt with are purely physical or material. It is possible to some extent, and may be very helpful, even when dealing with economic, or social, or psychological questions. But it is next to impossible in the seminary because of the nature of the subjects to be considered. You cannot take a soul into the laboratory and analyze it. You cannot weigh the burden of guilt which rests upon the conscience of one who has done wrong. You cannot measure the pangs of remorse suffered by one who has lost hope. You cannot experiment with the conversion of a sinner, or with the convincing of a skeptic, or with the healing of a broken heart, or the winning back of a prodigal son or daughter. Our Seniors find out how hard it is really to preach a sermon before a professor and the class. They can declaim, or recite, or read, and of course something may be learned from this exercise. But it is seldom really preaching. It would be simply impossible to experiment in a multitude of other tasks and duties which come to every preacher and pastor when in charge of a congregation. The practical part of the work just must be learned, for the most part, in the hard school of experience after leaving the seminary, and neither students nor professors are responsible for this fact.

Hence I come back again to the proposition that to be just and helpful criticism of the theological seminary must be based on a right apprehension of the nature and functions of such an institution.

What, then, is a theological seminary? I can perhaps best answer this question by a process of elimination.

Let me say first, then, that the theological seminary is not a preparatory school. It is not intended, and should not be expected, to teach the rudiments of a general education. It is not supposed to teach reading, and writing, and arithmetic, nor grammar and rhetoric. The students should know these things when they enter the semi-

nary. They should at least be able to read, and write, and speak the English language correctly, though, alas, my own experience in class-room work compels me to recognize the fact that not all of them do. But this is just the reason why the seminary should not be held responsible if its graduates cannot write and speak grammatically, and can not even read the Scriptures without blundering. It is not the business of a theological seminary to teach these things. They should have been learned long before the students reach the seminary, far back in the common schools or in the preparatory schools, and in the college.

It is true that we have in our seminary here a course of an hour a week with each class in "English" scheduled. It is no doubt an inheritance from the early days of the institution, when preparatory schools were few and of low grade, and when public schools were unknown. In those days many young men came to the seminary, of necessity, with very little preliminary training. Then, such a course was a wise provision, and a proper one. But I have felt ever since I have been connected with the faculty that in these days it is an anachronism, and ought to be abandoned and the time devoted to other subjects. At the same time, I am sorry to say that the evidences of its continued need with some of the students, in spite of all the advantages of preparatory training that they have had, are often so overwhelming and so paralyzing, that I do not see how we can actually do without it. But it surely ought not to be so.

In the second place, the seminary is not a college. The college is intended to give young men a broad and general education in the languages, ancient and modern, in literature, especially our own, in science, and economics, in sociology and philosophy, &c., &c. It is intended to develop the mind and the character, to build up manhood, to provide a generous culture that will fit a man for the duties of citizenship and make him a useful member of society, and that may also be made the foundation for whatever special training he may take later to prepare him for a particular profession or occupation. The mis-

fortune is that, in these later years, the greed for gold, and the consequent haste to get through with the schools and to begin to earn money, have led to the introduction of many technical or professional courses in the college, and to a system of wide electives, which have robbed the college course of much of its cultural value, and tend to turn out narrow specialists instead of broad-minded men who would be at least fairly well fitted for any profession, or for any station in life. This kind of training is the work of the college, and not of the seminary. If the student has not gained such a liberal culture before he enters the seminary, he is not likely to get it there. It is not the business of the seminary to give it.

In the third place, the seminary is not a university. The Century Dictionary defines a university as "an association of men for the purpose of study, which confers degrees which are valid throughout Christendom, is endowed, and is privileged by the State in order that the people may receive intellectual guidance, and that the theoretical problems which present themselves in the development of civilization may be resolved." Cardinal Newman, in his lectures on "University Teaching" defines a university as "a place of teaching universal knowledge," and then goes on to say that "this implies that its object is, on the one hand, intellectual, not moral; and, on the other, that it is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement." Mr. Huxley says that "universities should be places in which thought is free from all fetters, and in which all sources of knowledge, and all aids of learning should be accessible to all comers, without distinction of creed or country, riches or poverty." Hence, when Ezra Cornell gave his millions to found Cornell University at Ithica, New York, he announced it as his purpose to found a school in which any student in the world could study any subject that he wished to understand.

But the term university is used in this country with a very wide latitude of meaning. We have universities, so-called, that are not even first-class colleges. The fact is that we have no real university in the United States.

Johns Hopkins, in Baltimore, was organized by its first president, Dr. Gilman, and began its work on the true university plan, but it soon introduced undergraduate courses and became, like all our other so-called universities, more of a college than a university. The true university is a graduate school purely, and is devoted to the discovery and the dissemination of truth, and to the training of specialists in the various departments of knowledge who may become teachers or original investigators who shall broaden and enrich the general sum of human knowledge by their work. The seminary is a school for the teaching of only one subject, namely theology in all its forms, exegetical, biblical, dogmatic, historical, ecclesiastical, practical, &c. It cannot be expected, therefore to teach science, and philosophy, and economics, and sociology, and the many other subjects which may be embraced in a university course. It may discuss the relation of some of these to theology, and to the practical work of the minister and the Church. But the subjects themselves must be studied elsewhere. The seminary curriculum, and the time of the professors and students, are fully occupied with the special subjects to be pursued, and there is no room for other courses no matter how interesting, or even valuable, they might be in themselves, unless the students are prepared to spend three or four years more in the seminary than they now usually do.

Again, it may be said, and should be said, I think, that the seminary is not really a graduate school, in the proper sense of the word, even though practically all of its students are college graduates. A true graduate school is one in which the same subjects pursued in college are continued, and the study of them is further prosecuted on the basis of the work already done. This is the specific work of the university. Nearly all the subjects embraced in the seminary course are taken up *de novo*. The average student, on entering the seminary, knows practically nothing of Dogmatic or Biblical Theology, or of Church History, or of the History of Doctrine, or of Hebrew and Greek Exegesis, or of Liturgics or Symbolics, or of Homiletics or Catechetics, &c., &c. He does not even know the

meaning of most of these terms, and has no clear idea of what they stand for. He may have gained a slight smattering of some of these subjects from his general reading, or in his contact with men, or through his work in the Sunday School and in various other church activities. But very often this is erroneous, and must be unlearned, before he is ready to learn anything correctly about them.

Speaking positively, now, the theological seminary is in fact a professional school, just as a law school is, or a medical school, or an engineering school, or a normal school, or any other kind of school that seeks to give to a young man, otherwise already prepared for his life-work, the necessary technical knowledge and training for his specific task. Of necessity, this fact must govern and determine both the curriculum to be followed and the character of the work to be done. It requires that both should be somewhat narrow, and technical and professional. The object is to train men for a particular work, the work of the ministry, and only those subjects can be admitted which contribute to this end. There can be no attempt at general or universal scholarship. That is the work of the university, and not of the seminary.

Indeed, I think it may be said that it is not primarily the business of the seminary to make scholars at all, even in its own line of work. Its primary business, and its whole *raison d'être*, is to make good preachers and good pastors, men who shall be experts in the "cure of souls," and capable leaders in the Church, and in the communities in which they live, in every good cause, and in every good work.

Scholars are not made, anyhow; they become. Scholarship is not a gift of the schools; it is a personal achievement, and it requires time. An institution may encourage and stimulate a young man in acquiring scholarly tastes, and habits, and methods of work. But if he is ever to become a scholar it can only be by his own efforts, and after years of patient and painstaking labor. This is the main reason why there are so few genuine scholars. It is not for the lack of ability; no great ability is required. It is not for lack of genius; no genius is neces-

sary, except the genius for hard work. It does require this, and plenty of it, kept up for years and years. It may be said of the kingdom of scholarship, as of the kingdom of heaven, that the way thereto is narrow, and the gate strait, and few there be that find it. Only those may hope to enter in who are willing to pay the price, to strive, to agonize, to deny themselves daily, to take up their crosses, and ever to follow on towards the goal.

Even the subjects which are included in the seminary course cannot be studied very fully or exhaustively, for lack of time. If a student were to devote all his time, throughout the entire three years, to the study of Theology, or Church History, or History of Doctrine, or Old Testament and New Testament Exegesis, he could not hope to exhaust these great fields of investigation. The same thing is true of many other subjects. How then could he expect to gain an exhaustive knowledge of all of them? The best that can be hoped for is to gain a kind of bird's-eye view of the several subjects, to get a broad outline which may serve as a guide in his subsequent work and which may be filled in with more full and specific information as he continues his studies in after years.

This, again, is no just cause of reproach against the theological seminary. It is the same with all other technical or professional schools. No sensible person expects the law school, or the medical school, or the engineering school, to turn out great scholars. They are quite content, and the world gives them due credit, if they succeed in making fairly good lawyers, or doctors, or engineers. They are recognized as doing very well, indeed, if from among their many graduates they produce a few who ultimately, after years of practice, take first rank in their professions. Why should more be expected of theological seminaries, which have the same kind of raw material to deal with, and a much wider range of subjects to teach, and a very much more difficult work to prepare its students for?

A still further limitation is imposed on the work of the theological seminary by reason of the fact that, almost without exception, they are denominational institutions.

I doubt if there are any real exceptions. Seminaries are not intended, and were not founded to train men for the ministry in general, but for the ministry of a particular Church, say the Lutheran Church, or the Presbyterian, or the Methodist, or the Baptist. Hence most of the subjects are approached, and are considered, from the peculiar standpoint of the denomination to which the institution belongs, or with which it is affiliated. In a Lutheran seminary the theology taught will be Lutheran theology, of course. Church History will be studied and interpreted so as to exhibit the genesis, and development, and work of the Lutheran Church. So of Church Polity, Catechetics, Symbolics, Liturgics, &c. Even in such subjects as Exegesis, and Homiletics, and Missions and Sunday School work, denominational traditions, and tendencies, and preferences, will be more or less influential.

Neither is this to be condemned, or deplored, as mere sectarian bigotry, or narrowness. It is the natural thing, and the right thing. It is nothing more than loyalty to type, and to the purposes of the founders and supporters of the institution. It would be a breach of faith and of trust if it were otherwise. You would not expect anything else, therefore, you could not expect anything else, if you are reasonable and sensible. Nobody expects an allopathic medical school to teach homeopathic therapeutics, nor *vice versa*. To do so would be suicidal. Just as little could, or should, you expect to find Calvinistic, or Arminian theology taught in a Lutheran seminary, except in a comparative way and in order to demonstrate to the students how much more rational, and true and biblical Lutheran theology is. The same thing is true to a greater or less degree of all the other subjects included in the curriculum.

Let me say, and say it most emphatically, that in all this I am offering no excuse or apology for weak and unscholarly work in the seminary by either professors or students. Not at all. The work should be scholarly as far as it goes. That is, it should be first class work, and it should be thoroughly done, as thoroughly as the time and facilities at command will permit.

The professors should know their subjects, and know them well. They should know much more than they have time to teach. It is this excess of knowledge that gives reserve power to the teacher, as well as to the preacher or other public speaker, whatever his theme. The man who must stand on tip toes, or thrust out his arm at full length, to reach his opponent, can never strike very telling blows. Whenever a man must strain to his utmost to do his work at all, it cannot be well done, whether it be in the pulpit, or on the platform, or in the professor's chair. Such work always argues a weak man, and will itself be weak and ineffective. It is the man who works with ease because he has a large reserve of power that he does not need to use, whose work is strong and effective, whether it be physical or mental. I have observed that some automobiles are just able to crawl up the hill in front of my house, with much straining and fussing. Others fairly leap up the hill as a bird rises into the air, or as a strong skater skims over the ice. It is easy to see which have the stronger engines and are the better machines.

Of course no professor can be expected to know all about his subjects in these days of much study, and many books, and constant investigation and advance in all departments of knowledge. No professor can be expected to answer off-hand all the possible questions that a student may ask, or at once to settle categorically all the problems that may arise in a recitation or discussion. It is always safe to distrust the real knowledge and the genuine scholarship of a teacher who never says, "I do not know." Either he is a conceited ass himself, or he mistakes his students for asses and is simply bluffing. But every teacher should be growing in knowledge and in ability to teach all the time. Every true teacher is.

The students also must be real students and not merely loafers, or bluffers. This brings me now to my third answer to the question of how to get the most and the best out of the seminary course.

III. *The Student Must Have a Full and Clear Recognition of His Own Functions as a Student, and be Ready to Perform Them.*

This is no less important than what has gone before, but the passing of time bids me hasten towards a conclusion. Hence I must be more brief in my treatment of this part of my subject. To facilitate matters I shall lay down several distinct and definite propositions, and say a few words on each of them.

1. The student must be teachable. He must have a docile spirit. He must recognize his own limitations in knowledge and experience. He must be willing to sit at the feet of his teachers and learn. This does not mean that he is to surrender his judgment and will to the mere *ipse dixit* of his teachers. Not in the least. I shall have something more to say on that later, in the discussion of another proposition. It does mean, however, that he shall recognize the fact that his teachers are likely to know more than he does of the subjects in hand, that however strongly convinced he may be in his own mind, he may still be mistaken because he may not have looked far enough into the subject, or far enough beyond it, to get all the facts. The true student, like the true scholar, is always humble, because he knows that he may have overlooked some material fact, or facts, that would have entirely changed his point of view, or greatly modified his conclusions. It is only the sciolist, the superficial thinker, the scholastic pretender and quack, who always dogmatizes, and speaks *ex cathedra*, and will brook no contradiction or correction. It is sometimes amusing, as well as surprising, to the professor to hear a student object to his views, and try to sustain his objection, not by argument, but by the statement that he has examined the subject thoroughly and thought it through to a conclusion, and that he knows that he is right and the professor wrong. It is of course always possible that this may be the case. But the probabilities are that the professor has thought about the subject much more than the student has, and has examined it much more thoroughly, and that he is right and the student wrong. I have seen Mr. Huxley quoted somewhere as saying, that the only student whom it is impossible to teach anything, is the one who thinks that he knows it all already. Unfortunately some such

students seem sometimes to get into the seminary. Beware of their "leaven" if you would be true students, and would really learn anything while here. Such a spirit acts upon a student's mind as a raincoat acts upon his body, and resists all efforts at the impartation of knowledge as the raincoat sheds the rain.

2. The student must be studious. He must be a real student, willing to work, and to work hard, all through the course. Some students seem to think that the professors should do all the work, and that their business as students is simply to receive what the professors have to give. I was very much interested this summer in watching a pair of wrens that nested on our porch feeding their young. From early dawn until evening twilight the two parent birds were busy fetching worms and insects to the nest, while the three or four little wrens lay in the nest taking eagerly all they brought, and like little *Oliver Twist* always clamoring for more. This well illustrates the attitude of some so-called students towards their teachers. The professors are to gather and to carry learning, the students are to receive it if it pleases their taste, and to "knock" because they do not bring more, or because it is not of better quality. It worked very well with the birds. The little wrens grew fast under the parental feeding, and in a few weeks they were able to leave the nest and take care of themselves. But it will not work with students. No student can grow in wisdom, or in favor with God or man, certainly not with his professors, under such a regime. You might as well expect to see a quart jar grow into a ten gallon firkin by pouring water into it, or the richest kind of oil or food for that matter. Nothing grows that way. The body grows only by digesting and assimilating the food that it takes in. The same is true of the mind. Even the little wrens had to digest and assimilate the food brought to them by the parent birds. For mental digestion and assimilation there must be study, meditation, thought, serious, genuine and prolonged thought and study.

3. The student must study intensively. He must not be satisfied with an easy absorption, or any hasty and

superficial work. I greatly fear that there is not a little make-believe study in our seminaries, as elsewhere. A student sits in a comfortable rocker, with his feet on the table, his head thrown back, and a book in his lap, and calls that studying. Or, he lies on the lounge, or on the bed, with his eyes shut, and thinks that he is thinking. The probabilities are that he is neither thinking nor studying, but just killing time, just plain loafing. Some one tells the story of a traveler in a remote mountain region, who found an old couple living alone in a little cabin, far from any neighbors and with no apparent occupation. Surprised at their evident contentment with their lot, he asked them how in the world they managed to spend their time. "Waal," said the old man, "sometimes we set on the porch and think, and sometimes we jest set." I fear that some students spend too much time "jest settin'." To get the most out of the seminary course, really to get anything out of it, there must be genuine hard work done by the students, and plenty of it. Professor Ladd says very truly, that "knowledge is pre-eminently one of those 'good things', all of which, according to the old Greek proverb, 'the gods sell to men only if they are willing to pay the price in toil'." ("The Teacher's Practical Philosophy, p. 161). Students must get down and dig, and dig hard and deep. If they cannot go to the bottom of a subject, they must go as far as they can in that direction. We hear a great deal these days of intensive farming. By this is meant more careful cultivation of the soil, and deeper cultivation, that will make available for the growing crops all the nutritive qualities of the soil. It means also the constant and wise feeding of the soil so as to supply whatever qualities it lacks to make it most productive. By these means it is hoped to double the output of our farms and gardens. We need also more intensive study by which all the mental powers of the students shall be developed, and all the cultural value of the subjects pursued shall be utilized. The students must seek to master their subjects, not only to understand them, but to make the truths and facts really their own.

Students often speak of "getting out" a recitation.

What they mean is, I suppose, getting out of the text-book, or lecture notes, what is said on a subject so that they can go into the class-room and make a good recitation. This is well enough as far as it goes. But it is a more important thing to get the subject matter of the text-book or the lecture into themselves, so that it will become a permanent possession, a part of their general stock of knowledge, which will enrich their minds and ever afterwards be available for use. This requires more than mere reading or memorizing. It requires mental absorption, or assimilation. This is rather slow and laborious process. It requires time and effort. But it will greatly increase the output as well as the input, both in quantity and in quality. It is well worth the time and the effort. You can run a pound of meat through a sausage grinder in half a minute, but the grinder is no stronger or fatter after the process than it was before. If the same pound of meat is eaten by a growing boy, he will digest it and assimilate it, and turn it into bone and muscle, and sinew, and he will be larger and stronger as the result. But this will take a whole day, perhaps several days. It will be of little profit to the student to get a recitation in or out, or in and out both, after the fashion of the sausage grinder. He needs to use it as the boy uses the meat. Then he will grow just as the boy does, and every day become larger, and stronger, and better, and better prepared for the work that is before him. No lesson should be hastily skimmed over just for recitation. No subject should be slighted because he was called on at the last recitation, and does not expect to be called on again for at least a week. No student should be satisfied with just getting through, or even with a fair grade. He should always seek to do the very best work he possibly can. There is a proverb which says that "the good is the enemy of the best." Nowhere is this more true than in the work of the student. If he is content with doing good work, not to say poor work, he will never do the best, not even his best. We should always aim at the best. This is what I mean by intensive study.

4. The student must study extensively. By this I

mean that the student should never be satisfied with doing merely the required work of the course. He should reach out for broader investigation and larger results. To this end he should do as much collateral reading and study as possible. If a text-book is used, that is only a general guide. That gives him the views of only one author. He should seek to go farther afield, and to get the views of other writers also. If lectures are given, it is still only one man who speaks, and that too, of necessity, very briefly and hurriedly. He may be giving the results of wide reading and of much thought. But the student should do some reading and thinking, and make some investigations for himself.

Besides, there will be many collateral subjects, or brief suggestions, which should be followed up. This can be done only by the examination of texts, or by looking up the references that are given. The more of this that is done the better. It is better both for the student and for the teacher. As a preacher, I always like to speak on a subject in which I know that my hearers are interested, and on which I know that they are well informed. Then I am sure of an intelligent and an interested hearing, and this is a stimulus to me to try to do my best. The same thing is true in the class-room. If the professor knows that his students are reading other books on the subject it puts him on his mettle. He does not want them to know more of the subject than he does. It also enriches their understanding and appreciation, and he knows that they will get much more out of his instructions.

Besides this, there is a vast body of general literature, history, biography, science, philosophy, poetry, essays, and even fiction, the reading of which would broaden the mind, enrich the thought, and quicken the imagination of the students, and which ought to receive some attention during the seminary course. Probably most students think that it will be time enough to do this kind of reading when they get out into the active ministry, and have more leisure, and more command of their time. They are likely to find that just the contrary will be true. When they leave the seminary and take a pastoral charge, they

are likely to find that they have much less leisure, and much less command of their time, than they have here. The making of sermons, the insistent demands of their pastoral work, the meeting of committees, the direction of societies, the attendance on conventions, the burden of administrative work and multiplied engagements of various kinds, will be found to cause such a drain on their time and strength and nervous energy that there will be little of either left to give to general reading and study. It will be wise, therefore, for them to do as much as possible of this while in the seminary. They will thus accumulate a stock of general knowledge and of illustrative material that will be a rich and invaluable store on which to draw in the days to come.

I have heard of seminary students making complaint that they did not have enough work to keep them busy. That is surely a very strange complaint to come from a student in an institution which has, as practically all theological seminaries do have to-day, a whole library of choice books, including the latest and best cyclopedias on all kinds of subjects, and many of the finest literary and theological magazines and reviews published in this and in other lands, open at all times to his free and unrestricted use. What can a man mean, what can a man think, who says, under such circumstances, that he does not have enough to do? He surely must have a very crude idea, and a very limited vision, of what it is to be a student, and of what his privileges and opportunities are as such. The seminary curriculum is purposely not too much crowded, just to allow room and time for this collateral and general reading, and the student who fails to do it, whether through ignorance or through indolence, makes a very great mistake and will certainly not get the most or the best out of his seminary course.

5. The student must study critically. He should always keep his wits about him, his reasoning faculties wide awake, his judgment alert and active. Whether he is studying a text, or listening to a lecture, or reading a book, he should always be asking himself, "Is that true?" and "Why is it true?" and "What does it mean?" and

“What does it matter?” and similar questions. Who? What? How? Why? and To what end?—These are the tests to which all that he hears, or reads, or learns, should always be brought.

Otherwise he will be a mere trailer, following blindly in the wake of his teachers, or the authors whom he reads. Such a student is little better than a parrot thoughtlessly and senselessly repeating what he has learned from others. Mrs. Browning has written somewhere,

“We get no good
By being ungenerous even to a book
And calculating profits, so much help
By so much reading. It is rather when
We gloriously forget ourselves and plunge
Soul-forward, headlong, into a book’s profound,
Impassioned for its beauty and salt of truth,—
’Tis then we get the right good from a book.”

This is very pretty poetry, but it seems to me to be very bad advice, at least for a student. It was thus that, as a boy, I read Abbott’s History of Napoleon as it was first published as a serial in “Harper’s Magazine.” I never questioned any statement made. I never suspected any undue exaltation of the hero of the tale. I literally, ‘gloriously forgot’ myself and ‘plunged headlong’ into the wonderful story, as Mrs. Browning advises, with all a boy’s enthusiastic admiration for that strange man who raised armies as by magic, and overthrew his enemies as by a word, and overturned empires and set up kingdoms like a god, and seemed for a time to hold the destinies of all Europe in his single hand, and to shape them according to his own will. The result has been that even to this day the charm still lingers about his name, and I find it hard to bring myself to acknowledge, what is so certainly true, that with all his great genius he was a selfish and brutal tyrant, who loved no man, and worshiped no god, but himself.

Surely such a surrender to the author we are reading

is not wise. No doubt if we would really enjoy a book, we must have some measure of confidence in the author, in his ability, and integrity, and honesty of purpose. If we cannot trust him at all, we would better not read his book. We would not care to converse, or keep company, with a man whose every statement we must doubt or call in question. But there is far more of instruction, and mental stimulus, in reading a book in a judicial frame of mind, and with an independent judgment, ready to approve and endorse what merits approval and endorsement, and equally ready to condemn and reject whatever may be false or unsound. It is said that the chameleon takes the color of any tree, or bush, or rock near which it happens to be, and therefore changes its color every time it changes its place. This is nature's method of providing for its protection from its enemies, and for this purpose is a wise and beneficent provision. But the reader or student who always thinks exactly as the author whom he reads, and changes his opinions with every new book that he reads, is a very poor kind of a student.

Here, also, we find the corrective, or, rather, the complement, of my first proposition under this point, that the student must be teachable. He is to be teachable, but not too pliable. He is to be modest, but not subservient. He is to be humble, but not obsequious. His humility must not be of the Uriah Heep type. He should respect his teachers, but not worship them, nor follow them blindly and slavishly. He may and should ask for the proofs, for good and sufficient reasons. You will remember the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius in which Polonius hastens to agree with Hamlet though every new assertion of the latter contradicts all that he said before.

"Hamlet. Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?

Polonius. By the Mars, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

Hamlet. Methinks it is like a weasel.

Polonius. It is backed like a weasel.

Hamlet. Or, like a whale.

Polonius. Very like a whale."

Polonius thus falls in with every changing whim of

the prince, partly because he is an obsequious courtier and wishes to court the prince's favor, and partly because he believes the prince to be mad, and fears to contradict him, or does not think it expedient. Only a sycophant student would agree thus readily with a professor, whatever he may teach, and none but a mad professor would expect a student to accept his *ipse dixit* for everything without stopping to ask for explanation or proofs. The true and wise teacher always is pleased to have his students ask questions, or raise objections, provided it is done in a respectful and courteous manner, because it shows that they are thinking for themselves, that they are interested in the subject, and that they are really eager to learn.

6. The student must study prayerfully. Under this I wish to include the care of his entire spiritual life. This is most important. Indeed, it is so obvious a necessity that it seems as though it would not be necessary to dwell upon it even for a moment to insist on it. Yet there are not wanting reasons to fear that it may be necessary. There are good reasons to fear that some young men enter the theological seminary without any very deep or clear experience of the saving power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and without any very full and hearty consecration of themselves to the work of preaching that Gospel to a perishing world. They enter the seminary just as they might enter a law school, or a school of medicine, to prepare for a profession and to get ready to earn a livelihood. Others, who come to the institution in a devout and serious frame of mind, seem to grow cold and indifferent during the course. Both are greatly to be lamented, of course. As Dr. Howard Crosby says, in his closing lecture on "The Christian Ministry," "The seminary should not chill the godly heart, but increase its warmth and strengthen every grace. It should prove a quickener of every spiritual faculty, and not simply address itself to the intellect of its students. The seminary should, as the vestibule of the pulpit, give the holy afflatus that the pulpit should ever exhibit." (Page 175). Dr. Crosby then goes on to discuss the possible reasons for

the chilling of the religious fervor, and the spiritual loss, on the part of some students in the seminary. He thinks that sometimes the professors may be at fault because they conduct their work in a too cold and perfunctory way, and do not lay sufficient emphasis on the spiritual side, and on the vital nature, of the subjects discussed. This may be true. Again, he suggests that sometimes it may be the result of using the Bible in the class-room, and in the students' rooms, in a merely formal and critical way, and not with a view to spiritual enlightenment and edification. Sometimes, he thinks it may be the fault of the students themselves in not using diligently the means for mutual encouragement and growth in the Christian life. All of these causes may contribute to the sad result. But I suspect that the third one is the chief one, the lack of a prayerful life, and of mutual watchfulness over their spiritual welfare.

If you would keep yourselves warm in the love of God, and of your fellowmen, you must go to your work daily with a sense of your dependence on God for success in it, and of responsibility to him for the way in which it is done. You should close the day in the same manner. You must not neglect your private devotions. You must not neglect the morning and evening services for social worship, nor the weekly prayer-meeting. Moreover, you should speak often one to another about the things of God, and about the spiritual side of your work here and in the years to come. Let me quote one more sentence from Dr. Crosby, in closing. He says, "I know no happier picture than that of a band of young men, in the first flush of their experience that the glory of Christ is all that is worth living for, reaping their first fruits of joy from their new fields and talking together of the triumphs of grace which they have witnessed. This should be the typical seminary picture." (Page 176).

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

MELANCHTHON'S DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES
FROM LUTHER.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

1. As to the law Luther held that its office in producing conviction of sin, bringing before the sinner the wrath of an offended God, was indispensable. This repentance thus produced was necessary. After that, the work of the law was done, except pedagogically and as a help or light. It could no longer tyrannize over the conscience as before justification, for Christ had saved us from it. Melanchthon did not deny that the law had an office with the sinner, though he thought that the chief means of penitence was not law but Gospel. But for the later life of the Christian he brought in the law in a more effective way than Luther. It is not only the divine preparation for the Gospel, but it is its correlate, founded by God in the spiritual world. The Christian must do the works of the law. The law has three uses. (1) Pedagogical or political. God coerces all men by discipline, so they will not do external transgressions. This is the pedagogical or disciplinary use of the law. For these reasons: (a) It is necessary to exalt it on account of the command of God, to whom obedience is due. (b) That punishments may be avoided, by which either the magistrate or God punishes atrocious transgressions. (c) For the cause of public peace. God demands discipline, lest we should injure the bodies or fortunes of others, and he demands peace and quietness. (d) The fourth cause is, because discipline is a schoolmaster to Christ. (He has some excellent remarks on this). (2) The second use of the law is as a correction of errors of judgment regarding sin and righteousness (or justice). It is to show sin, to accuse, to terrify and condemn all men in this corruption of nature. The law is the eternal judgment of God, condemning sin in the human race; because the note of the law of

nature is written on the soul, and because it is revealed by various ways by voice and example, as God denounced disobedience and added punishment, as the testimonies of his judgment against sin. The law shows what sin is and warns against it. (3) For the regenerate. When it is said they are freed from the law it is meant free from the curse and damnation of the wrath of God. They conquer the terrors of sin, so long as they have faith. Meanwhile the law is to be taught, which discloses the remains of sin, so that the recognition of sin and penitence may be increased, and at the same time the voice of the Gospel sound out that faith may grow. So the law is to be put forth before the regenerate that it may teach them certain works in which God wills that we should exercise obedience. For when human reason is not ruled by the Word of God it readily errs. So though we are liberated from the law as to condemnation, because we are justified by faith for the sake of the Son of God, the law remains, because it is the divine ordinance, so that the justified obey God.¹ This admirable discussion of the three-fold use of the law is hardly in the spirit of Luther, who though he retained the law for the outer court, the external life of Christians, did not emphasize it in the way Melanchthon did.

2. I do not find much difference in atonement. The chief difference is the more legal aspect given by Melanchthon. Luther taught a penal substitutionary atonement in a massive and strong way, but Melanchthon worked the matter out legally with more particularity than Luther. Christ fulfilled the law of God, and bore the punishment due to it. There is now an adjustment between his mercy and justice, on the ground of which the sinner can be saved.

3. Melanchthon was inclined to distinguish the blessings received at conversion in a more minute way than Luther. With Luther all came at once in justification. With Melanchthon there is, first, penitence, then faith,

¹ *Loci Praecipui Theologici*, ed. 1559, Berlin 1856, pp. 48-50. The above is in part translated from the *Loci*.

the gift of the Spirit, and finally newness of life and morals.

4. Predestination and free will. In the first edition of the *Loci* Melanchthon went all the way with Luther on these dark doctrines. They were substantially what came to be called Calvinists. But Melanchthon worked himself free from this theology, and became more synergistic. In the new edition of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans 1532, he emphasizes that God's elections according to Paul are not according to Jewish preferences, but according to his own mercy and will. He emphasizes the universality of the promise, and shows that until Augustine the Fathers placed the cause of election in man, and not in an absolute decree of God. He says it is no good searching into these matters of divine election. The chief thing is to be convinced that there is no salvation except in Christ, and when one feels uncertainty then hang upon the universality of the promise, for puzzling one's brains is only doubt and takes away the consolation of the Gospel. One should not bind oneself to a secret decree of God, but on the work of Christ, on redemption through Him.

The doctrine that everything happens out of necessity Melanchthon from now (about 1532) on describes as a doctrine of Stoics and incompatible with Christianity. This inconsistency of extreme predestination with religion and morals was one reason for his new edition of the *Loci*, 1535. The assertion that everything happens by necessity is dropped, and contingency of human actions takes its place. Christians must not dispute and trouble themselves over these things but keep to the Scripture. God is not the author of sin, but the devil and the human will. Man is a free personality. Adam misused his will. Sin is not necessary. Man's will is still free in all human affairs. Although God foresees all things, yet he does not do away with our freedom. In the *Loci* of 1535 he gives three causes for conversion: the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the will not inactive, but striving against its weakness. Here he becomes a synergist.

In this edition also Melanchthon withdraws the ex-

treme expressions of the first concerning total depravity. Before conversion man has a real honor in legal and external matters. He can do the outside works of the law. But he cannot do the spiritual, the matters that relate to God. But in these matters he can hear the Word with diligence, instead of following his inborn sluggishness and natural unbelief. "God draws man, but He draws only the willing."² After 1548 Melanchthon used the Erasmian definition of freedom as the "faculty of applying one's self to grace."

A word or two more on this important change in Melanchthon. Not only passages like Mt. 7:11, Rev. 3:20, but such as spoke of mutual relations of God and man, led him to larger conceptions here, as well as the moral danger of extreme predestinarianism. So also the actual experience of Christians in conversion,—their anxiety of conscience, their struggles show that something real happens on their side. "During the lifetime of Luther and after," he said, "I have rejected these Stoic and Manichean errors which Luther and others have written, that all works good and bad must so happen in all men good and bad. For it is apparent that this teaching is against God's Word, is injurious to all discipline, and is blasphemous against God."³ Luther himself, he said, had given up the absolute part of his theory, because he (Luther) used to write letters of consolation to the doubting. "I and others have often in his presence heard how he consoled others, that they should hold themselves on the promise, which is universal, and not exclude themselves." The common picture of Luther by Catholics and some Protestants as an obstinate Bourbon, learning nothing and excommunicating everyone who disagreed with him in any way, is quite false when compared with the facts of Melanchthon's changes in the successive editions of the *Loci*, and Luther's still cordial relations with him. Luther was thoroughly familiar with the *Loci* of 1544, and yet he wrote of it in 1545.

² Schmidt, Philipp Melanchthon: Leben a. Ausgewählte Schriften, Elberfeld 1861, 308-11; Real Encyklop. f. Prot. Theol. w. Kirche, 3 Aufl. 12. 536 top.

³ Cor. Ref. 9. 766 (1559).

I have long withstood those who asked for an edition of my works. And this because I do not wish for these, the works of the ancients, to be neglected, and because we have through God's grace better methodical works, among which Philip's *Loci* is the best. A theologian and bishop can best learn out of that to be strong in holding forth on the doctrine of godliness.

Noticing these changes some of Melanchthon's friends joked him about desiring the favor of the bishops, and even Chancellor Brück rallied him in fun about snatching a cardinal's hat.⁴

Let me now translate the famous passage which Melanchthon introduced after Luther's death in the eighth edition (1548) of the 1543-44 edition of the *Loci*, and which appeared in all the twenty-five editions (except ninth, Wittenberg 1549) of that 1544 form of the *Loci* which were published up to Melanchthon's death in 1560⁵ (thirty-four were published up to 1595; this does not include the many editions published before 1544).

I have seen many not epicureans, who, when they were in some sadness over their sins, asked, How can I have hope when I do not perceive new light and new virtues poured into me? For if free will accomplishes nothing, I must, until I shall perceive that regeneration to be done concerning which you speak, yield to mistrust and other bad feelings. This horrible Manichean imagination (that free will has no part) is a lie, and by this error minds are mislead and teach that free will accomplishes something. Pharoah and Saul were not coerced, but of their own wills opposed God, though he showed them so many distinguished testimonies of his presence.

Nor are the ravings of the Manicheans to be received who invent a certain number of men, whom they call material and earthly, who cannot be converted. Nor is David converted as a stone is changed into a fig. But the free will in David

⁴ Cor. Ref. 5. 332 (1544).

⁵ Cf. Cor. Ref. 21. 658 note 27, 568-9, 592-3, 597.

worked something when he heard the threat and promise, willing now and his fault is freely acknowledged. And his will did something, when he supported himself with this word, The Lord has carried away thy sin. And when one endeavors to support himself with this word, he is comforted by the Holy Spirit, according to that (word) of Paul (Romans 1:16): The Gospel is the power of God to salvation to the one not opposing, that is, to the one not despising the promise, but consenting and believing. Also: The Gospel is the ministry of the Spirit. Also: We receive the promise of the Spirit of faith.

For if that infusion of qualities is to be expected without any action of ours, as enthusiasts and Manicheans assert, then there had been no struggle in the soul. But God has instituted the ministry that the word is received, that the mind ponders and embraces the promise, and while we oppose (our) distrusts, the Holy Spirit is at the same time efficacious in us.

To those therefore who excuse their tarrying, because they think free will accomplishes nothing, I answer: The command of God is eternal and unchangeable, that you should conform to the voice of the Gospel, hear the Son of God, and acknowledge the Mediator. How shameful the sins, not to be willing to look to the Mediator, the Son of God given to the human race! I am not able, you say. Not at all, you are able in a certain way; and when you support yourself on the word of the Gospel, having asked God to help you, you know that the Holy Spirit is effective in that consolation. Know that God wills to convert you in this way, when we stimulated by the promise struggle with ourselves, call upon Him and oppose our mistrusts and other bad inclinations.

Therefore some of the older ones (veteres, some think he means Erasmus here) have said: Free will is the faculty in man of applying himself to grace that is, he hears the promise and endeavors to assent

and put down sins against conscience. Such things are not done in devils. Therefore we should distinguish between devils and the human race. But they may be done by considering a more evident promise. When the promise is universal—nor are there contradictory wills in God—it is necessary to discriminate the cause why Saul is rejected and David accepted, that is, it is necessary for the action to be dissimilar in the two cases. These things are true and their use in the exercises of faith and for true consolation, when souls agree to the promise shown in the Son of God, will make clear this joining of causes,—on the Word of God, of the Holy Spirit, and of the will.⁶

Schmidt makes the point (*Melanchthon*, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 571) that this is no more at the bottom than Melanchthon had said in 1535 and '44, but at any rate it is one of the clearest statements of synergism ever made. It did not mean at all that there was anything Pelagian in Melanchthon, that he derogated from the indispensableness of divine grace. It simply means that man can feel the need, wish for conversion, for God, can co-operate with that wish not only by presenting no obstacle but by assenting to the grace that moves and sanctifies, an act of free will conditioning his relation to salvation. Nor did it mean that Melanchthon denied divine foreordination of all things in some sense unknown, or divine foreknowledge. In 1543 he wrote to Calvin that everything happens by divine foreknowledge and yet by human will, but how to harmonize the two he knows not. (Cor. Ref. 5: 109). When we fall it is our own fault entirely. The promise of divine grace is for all, and God helps all who struggle. There is no secret will of God for Christians, only the will revealed through Christ. For all who will accept grace, God is active by His Word. God has determined from eternity to save those who believe His Word. Predestination is for Melanchthon practically the same as justification. "Neither from reason nor from the law is election to be judged, but from the

6 *Loci* (1559) ed. Berlin 1856, pp. 24-25.

Gospel. It happens, for the sake of Christ, through faith. We should seek no other cause. As when speaking of justification we begin with the Gospel, so of election. The only cause of rejection is sin, striving against God's Word. Therewith we should console ourselves and be content." (22:417). "Those who are baptized, pray and believe that for Christ's sake their sins are forgiven, these are saved. When you hear the preaching of the Word, you should be certain that it applies to you, and not ponder over election or predestination, which is first to be judged at the end, as it is written, Blessed are those who die in the Lord. You should not doubt, but apply the promise to yourselves. If you have the beginning of faith, then God will help you farther." (25:438).

Luther wrote to Capito, leader of the Reformation in Strassburg, on July 9th, 1537, his striking words: "Concerning the disposing of my books I am very cold and slack, moved by that Saturnine hunger: I would rather they might all be devoured. (As Saturn devoured his own children, so I would not care if my books should also perish). For I recognize none of my books as right (justum), except perchance *De Servo Arbitrio* and the Catechism."⁷ This testifies to what we know elsewhere that Luther considered fundamental the religious basis of his contest with Erasmus on the will, involving as it did in his mind the alone supremacy of God as Saviour, the only Giver of every good and perfect gift, and as absolutely necessary to exclude the Pelagianism of Catholicism, and bring man back from Church and its commands to God alone. So he always felt that that message was central and indispensable, and therefore he excepted the *De Servo Arbitrio* from that tooth of time to which—with wonderful humility and unconcern for human fame—he willingly gave over his other books. But for all that, readers will remember the brilliant and learned articles of the lamented Prof. Dr. James W. Richard in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan.-July, 1902, where he showed that for the metaphysical aspects of predestination, for its theological significance outside of the above points,

7 De Wette, Briefe Luthers 5. 70.

Luther came to care less and less, but placed his emphasis on the *revealed* will of God to save all who believe, and expressly declared that justification (not enslaved will, nor predestination) is the head and sum of Christian doctrine. This evolution in Luther met the more radical one in Melanchthon, and thus it happened that the latter never had to defend his larger views with the former. Or, as we might say, neither Luther nor Melanchthon were in head or heart Calvinists, though providing for the truth in Calvin's doctrine.

That there was this difference Calvin himself saw. When Calvin read the later editions of the *Loci*, and saw too that Melanchthon struck out all passages on predestination in the Consensus Tigurinus (1549, the attempted union between the Swiss Churches), he wrote him: "To speak frankly, my religion hinders me from agreeing with you in this matter. You seem to me to teach too philosophically on free will, and in the treatment of election to seek for nothing except what is agreeable to the human understanding. For one cannot consider it a deception in a man so acute and thoroughly conversant with Scripture as yourself that you confuse election with the general promise."⁸ Later Calvin wrote that he could not understand how such a great theologian could reject predestination, nor does he want him to accept that doctrine because he (Calvin) teaches it but because it is the doctrine of the Bible.⁹

I have spoken of the fine picture of the friendship of the two Wittenberg reformers in spite of their differences, and here Calvin should come in for the same praise. In 1552 Calvin was attacked in Geneva on account of predestination, and his opponents appealed to the *Loci* of Melanchthon, French translations of which had appeared in 1546 and 1551, with a preface by Calvin. In an apology to the magistrate the great Frenchman said: "In order not to give curious people excuse to press in too deeply into the secrets of God, Melanchthon held himself too much to the general understanding. Therefore he spoke

8 Nov. 28, 1552. Quoted by Schmidt, 575.

9 Aug. 27, 1554. Ibid.

on these things more as a philosopher than a theologian. Not the less do I honor him on account of his remarkable learning and his virtues, and because he has worked truly for the spread of the Gospel. What I object to in him, I have not concealed. He allows me the freedom to do this, and on his part there are witnesses enough how much he loves me."¹⁰ This noble attitude of Calvin was not shared by Flacius and his friends after the Leipzig Interim of 1548, where with the fullest statement that all is from God to the exclusion of merit, it is also said that God works upon man not as with a block, but draws him, and his will works with God. The Flacians looked upon this as a repudiation of Luther, on whose standpoint of the unfree will they stood. From there they developed their system dialectically, while Melanchthon developed his psychologically and ethically from the starting point of the Gospel as revealed.

5. As to justification there was also an inclination on the part of Melanchthon to discriminate as in conversion in a more schoolmasterly way than Luther, and to bring in in his later life other elements than simple trust in the grace of God in Christ. As in the first edition of the *Loci*, he always remained true to the principle of Paul and Luther that the faith that secures justification is trust in Christ. He added to this, however, that the acceptance of the divine promise of salvation is connected with "assent to every word of God."¹¹ This intellectual process comes out again when he divides faith into "knowledge, assent, and trust."¹² "Faith is to assent to every word of God handed down to us and to the promise of Grace, and it is trust resting in God on account of the Mediator."¹³ At the same time there comes out to view beside the Gospel the sum of the articles of faith, and faith itself seems to be referred to as a formulated doctrine, after its mediation through the reception of salvation.¹⁴ All this time, of course, faith is still trust in the grace of God, and forgiveness of sins the organizing principle of the arti-

¹⁰ Oct. 6, 1552. Quoted by Schmidt, 575.

¹¹ Corp. Ref. 21, 164.

¹² 21. 790, 1079.

¹³ 23. 455.

¹⁴ C. R. 23. 19, 454.

cles of faith.¹⁵ But, as Kirn well says,¹⁶ this preservation on his part is no guarantee that later theologians would be as true as he was to the Christian principle of faith. And so it happened that later Lutheran orthodoxy emphasized the true doctrine, the acceptance of which presupposed and made possible the experience of salvation through personal faith. Melanchthon's later emphasis on the articles of faith thus became the connecting link with the high-and-dry orthodoxy that cut such a famous figure in German Church History.

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper cut such a large figure that it must be left for a separate article.

The main lesson of this paper is its light on the character of the two Reformers: that Luther was not at all the domineering theological despot Roman Catholics sometimes represent him, that Melanchthon did his own thinking in his own way and was allowed to do it. His agreement with Luther in essentials was not forced, but was the inmost bent of his soul. Harnack makes the remark in his 1897 *Festrede* that while a hearty intimacy between Luther and Melanchthon, if it ever sprung up, soon vanished, yet a mutual confidence asserted itself in spite of all difference of character, opinions and of work, and that in mutual tolerance between the two Luther was the more patient,—a very striking judgment.¹⁷

Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

NOTE.—Since the above article was sent in it has come to me that Melanchthon's synergism or his deviation from Luther in predestination and related topics has been denied. This denial springs from failing to distinguish synergism from the precious Bible doctrine that all we have comes from God, both our salvation and the will or moving impulse to receive it. Synergism affirms that also. All that it says in addition is that that will is actively engaged in receiving the salvation, and that it can either receive or reject. There were three stages in Melanchthon's mind here. First, in the *Loci* of 1521 and

¹⁵ 21. 422.

¹⁶ R. E. 12. 536.

¹⁷ Harnack, Philip Melanchthon: Akademische Festrede, Berlin 1897, p. 14.

the Annotation on Romans of 1522 he was a determinist and monergist, pure and simple and in the widest sense. Second, from further study of Scripture and Christian experience he gave up this extreme position, and said that though God anticipated, helped, and moved us, we participated also by not opposing. (C. R. 21:377). This was in the second fundamental revision of the *Loci* 1535. Third, in the third revision of 1543 ff he brings in the will as a third cause helping the Word of God and the Holy Spirit (21:658), and even adds the famous expression about the power of applying one's self to grace. The causes of this change in Melanchthon were (1) the deepening of his humanistic studies, (2) the practical effects of Luther's view, (3) further study of Scripture and the Church Fathers, and (4) the influence of Erasmus, with whom he kept up a lifelong friendship. Along with this went not a change in Luther's own view, but a change in his emphasis and attitude, so that this widening of Melanchthon found no opposing hand in Luther. In 1538 he wrote to Veit Diedrich, Luther's famulus, "You know that I speak less sternly concerning predestination, the assent of the will, the necessity of our obedience, and concerning mortal sin. Concerning all these things I know Luther feels the same." (3:380). On this Kahnis comments in words almost comically moderate, "from this passage we can at least conclude that in principle Luther's doctrine did not exclude a softening of those Augustinian excesses." Outside of Schmidt's massive life (see above) for proof that I have not misrepresented our Reformer in this see Kahnis, *Lutherische Dogmatik*, 2 Aufl. ii 224-8; Baur, *DG* 3 Aufl. 281; Thomasius *DG* 2 Aufl. 494-7; Lipsius, *Dogmatik*, 3 Aufl. 373-4. 440; Dörner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.* i 218-20, his *System of Doctrine*, iv. 170-3; Nitzsch F. A. B., *Evang. Dogmatik*, 1 Aufl. 18, 19; Hase, *Dogmatik*, 6 Aufl. 257-8; Loofs *DG* 4 Aufl. 782-98, 842-7; Seeberg *Hist. of Doctrine*. ii. 349 with comment of Richard in this *QUARTERLY* Jan. 1906, 138; and Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Melanchthons*, Gotha 1879, 67-107. Luthardt's book on *Free Will* and Galle's on *Melanchthon*, are to the same effect, but I do not have them.

ARTICLE III.

MAN'S PRE-EMINENCE AMONG CREATURES.

BY PROFESSOR J. M. HANTZ.

There is scarcely any portion of Holy Scripture concerning which so many and conflicting judgments have been passed, as the Book of Ecclesiastes. Controversies not only about its authorship and age, or about the interpretation of particular passages, but also about the general import and purpose of the entire book, have been carried by different critics, both in earlier and later times, to the most opposite conclusions. There is no book of the Old Testament which more plainly and positively sets forth the great truths of the personality and superintending providence of God; the weakness and ignorance of man; his dependence upon God; the religious obedience which he owes to God; the immortality of the soul and the certainty of a future judgment. [So much so, indeed, that some have considered the proof of this last doctrine to be the chief purpose of the book.] (Mendelssohn. *Apud Preston. Ecclesiastes* p. 4.) Texts including these great truths are familiar to all of us. "If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in a province, marvel not at the matter; for He that is higher than the highest regardeth; and there be higher than they." (Ch. 5:8). "In the day of prosperity be joyful, but in the day of adversity consider; God also hath set the one over against the other, to the end that man should find nothing after him." (Ch. 7:14) (i. e. to the end that man shall not trust to the future, but feel his dependence on God. See Hengstenburg). "Though a sinner do evil an hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before Him." (Ch. 8:12). "As thou knowst not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowst not the works

of God, who maketh all." (Ch. 11:5). "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth; and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." (Ch. 8:12). "As thou knowest not what is the way of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shall say, I have no pleasure in thee," (Ch. 12:1), and the solemn ending of the book: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Ch. 12:13, 14). Yet in the face of passages like these there have not been wanting critics in various ages, who have regarded the general tone of the book as the murmuring of the sated voluptuary or the despairing sceptic; (See Philastrius, *De Hur.* CVI. apud. Gallandi, Vol. 7, p. 510, and in modern times, Hartmann and Knobel. See Hengstenberg, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 33, 34; also De Wette, *Einleitung*. Sec. 282); who have extracted, as the chief tenor of its teaching, an exhortation to eat and drink, for to-morrow we die; who have seen, in its submission to God's will, nothing but a hopeless fatalism; who have even adduced it in evidence that its author, in common with his nation in general, had no belief in a future personal existence or a judgment to come. (Warburton. *Works* Vol. V, p. 197).

It would be impossible, in one article, to enter on a detailed examination of the various theories which have been propounded with regard to the character and purpose of this much disputed work. Yet a brief account of its general character and the course of its argument seems indispensable to the right understanding of such passages which, taken by themselves, and apart from their relation to the general argument, have led to conclusions injurious to the character of the book in itself, and utterly inconsistent with the position assigned to it by the Church as part of the Canon of Holy Scripture.

The Book of Ecclesiastes, if we look to the problems

with which it deals and the final conclusion at which it arrives concerning them, bears, though on a far smaller scale, no slight resemblance to the Book of Job. In both we find the same difficulty prominent in the mind of the writer—the difficulty arising from the apparent inequality of God's dealings with men in the present life; from the fact that good and evil fortune are not distributed to men in proportion to their deserts as good and evil doers. The same problem which is tossed to and fro in the discussion between the patriarch and his friends, the one maintaining his own integrity notwithstanding the afflictions with which he was visited. Thus far at least there is no ground on account of its philosophical tone to deny that the book may have been written by Solomon to whose age the Book of Job is referred by the majority of modern critics, even those who like Keil and Vaihinger assign a very late date to Ecclesiastes. At the same time it must be admitted that the question of authority does not necessarily affect that of canonicity. More is in evidence that the writer designed to have his work as the actual composition of Solomon—indeed the use of the past tense Ecclesiastes 1:12, may perhaps indicate a distinction between the author and the preacher. The writer might use Solomon's poems as the vehicle of his teaching, just as Plato uses Socrates, without any intention to deceive. The others contending that those afflictions must needs be the punishment of some special and exceptional wickedness, is pursued in the Book of Ecclesiastes through the solitary meditations of the preacher, anxious to maintain God's righteousness and His superintending providence over man, yet unable to reconcile that conviction with the actual phenomena of human life. As Job sees the wicked who live and are mighty in power and spend their days in wealth, (Job 21:7, 13), so the preacher sees in the days of his vanity the just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and the wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness. (Eccles. 7:15). If Job, before his triumphant declaration of the conviction that his Redeemer liveth, and that he himself shall behold God hereafter, (Job 19:25, 27) dwells despond-

ingly upon the thought that "man dieth and wasteth away," that he "lieth down and riseth not," (Job 14:10, 12) so the preacher, before declaring his final assurance that God shall bring every work with judgment (Eccles. 12:14) speaks in a like mournful strain of the dead who know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward. (Eccles. 9:5). If Job is driven by his own experience to declare the unsearchableness of God's ways, "Behold I go forward, but He is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him." (Job 23:8), the Preacher in like manner confesses, "Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man can not find out the work that is done under the sun; because though a man labors to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea farther, though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it." (Ec. 8:17).

The earlier part of the Book of Ecclesiastes may be made to harmonize with and support these conclusions, if we regard it as depicting a series of preliminary stages, by means of which the writer after vain attempts to secure his happiness by his own efforts, and to satisfy his doubts by his own iniquities, is brought at last to confess his ignorance of the ways of God, and to trust in the Divine Justice which shall be vindicated hereafter. The language of these preliminary stages is the appropriate experience of the speaker's state of mind at the time of its utterance; but it is no more to be taken as his final teaching, as the lesson which his book is intended to convey to his reader, than are the words of complaint and doubt wrung from Job in the bitterness of his soul, ere the Lord answered him out of the whirlwind and made him confess that he had uttered things that he understood not." (Job 42:3).

The clue to the real meaning of the seemingly strange and conflicting sentiments which appear on the surface of the Book of Ecclesiastes, may, I believe, be obtained, if we regard the work as a representation of the struggles and wanderings of an inquiring spirit, painfully working its way upwards from a material to a moral view of the world, from that aspect of the universe in

which it is regarded merely as a series of visible phenomena to that in which it is regarded as a system exhibiting a design and a purpose, established by the will and directed by the superintending care of a personal moral Governor. The former or mere physical aspect of things is the problem with which the book opens; and the difficulties which it presents to a thoughtful mind are presumed through the subsequent argument. Its most prominent feature may be briefly stated, the permanence of unconscious nature; the shortness and uncertainty of the life of conscious man. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but the earth abideth for ever." (Eccles. 1:4). It is the very same aspect of nature which presented itself in another age and another country to the contemplation of the Epicurean poet:

"*Damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae
Nos, ubi recidimus
Quo puis Aeneas, quo dives Tullus et Aeneus
Pulvis et umbra sumus.*"—Horace Od. IV, 7.13).

And the moral in both is that to which such a point of view naturally leads—"enjoy to-day; for no man can reckon upon to-morrow."

"*Quis scit an adjiciant hodiernae crastina summae
Tempora di superi
Cunata manus avidas fugient heredis amico
Quae dederis animo.*"

The same thought is more fully expressed in an epigram in the Greek Anthology which exhibits a still closer parallel:

*πίνε καὶ εὐ φραίνου τί γάρ ἄνριον ἢ τί τὸ μέλλον
Οὐδεὶς γινώσκει. μὴ τρέχε, μὴ κοπια.
Ὡς δύνασαι, χαρίσι, μεταδος, φάγε, θνητά λογίζου,
Τὸ ζῆν τοῦ μὴ ζῆν οὐδέν ὅλως ἀπέχει.
Πᾶς ὁ βίος τοιοσδε, ροπήμονον, ἄν προλάβῃς, σοῦ,
Ἀν δὲ θανῇς, ἑτέρου πάντα, σὺ δ' οὐδὲν ἔχεις.*

With this conclusion, drawn from the uncertainty of human fortunes, is combined another, drawn from the fixed order and permanence of the material world—an inference of the necessity of all events that take place, and

the inability of man to avert his destiny or change any portion of the determined order of things. "The thing that hath been it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." (Eccles. 1:9).

The practical conclusion derived from these two phases of the physical aspect of the world is that which is so bitterly expressed in the first two chapters of the book. It is vain to seek after wisdom, for the wisest of men cannot influence the fixed order of things. "That which is crooked cannot be made straight; and that which is wanting cannot be numbered." (Ch. 1:15). It is vain to seek after pleasure or possessions; for no man knows how long he will enjoy them, or what will become of them when they shall pass to his heirs. The slave of destiny and uncertain of the future, there is nothing for him to do but to enjoy the present moment. "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labor." (Ch. 2:24).

At this point, however, a new light seems, for a moment to break in upon the problem. Though man is helpless in himself, may not God so order the course of things in this world, that wealth and prosperity shall be the lot of the man who is good in His sight. All things have their appointed times by God's ordinance; has He not so ordered the world that in His own time it shall be well to the man that doeth good and judgment shall come upon the wicked? But this thought again is checked by another, which seems to be more in accordance with the actual state of things. The mere cycle of the world's changes intimates no superiority of men over brutes. As mere phenomena of the visible universe, both are subject to the same law; both have the same conditions of animal life and death. May not the oppression of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked be appointed for this very purpose—to humble the pride of man in any fancied wisdom or goodness of his own; to show that he has no pre-eminence over other animals, but is subject to the same law and the same destiny? If this be so,

the epicurean view of man's destiny leads naturally again to the epicurean maxim for man's practice. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Such appears to be the import of the startling language of Ecclesiastes 3:19-22 taken in connection with the train of thought which suggested it. It is not the ultimate conviction of the author, the ultimate lesson of the book; but the expression of a becoming phrase of doubt and despondency during the painful struggle by which that conviction and lesson are finally reached. And this view of the passage will, I think, be confirmed if we attend to the continuation of the thought in the chapter which immediately follows. "So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun; and behold the tears of *such as were* oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors *there was power*; but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead, more than the living which are yet alive. Yea, better *is he* than both they, which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun." (Ch. 4:1-3). Recurring in thought to the misery and suffering in the world, and contemplating it from the point of view last suggested, that man is but the sport of destiny, a mere phenomenon of nature, with the life of a beast and the death of a beast, the epicurean consolation that follows is at once made manifest, and the conclusion that followed is one of hopeless despondency,—“If this be so, death is better than both.” Byron in “Euthanasia,” says:

“Count o’er the joys thine hours have seen,
Count o’er the days from anguish free,
And know, whatever thou hast been,
’Tis something better not to be.”

The train of thought originally suggested by the preacher's own personal experience is there pursued over a wider field, in the contemplation of the condition of mankind in general; and the same melancholy view is once more presented. Successful labor leads but to

envy, and indolence to poverty. The rich man has no comfort in his wealth, and the king no safety of his throne; and all in their time pass away. They shall be gathered to the countless generations that have gone before; they shall be forgotten by those that shall come after. (This interpretation of verse 16, which is adopted by Plumptre in the article *Ecclesiastes* in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, seems more in harmony with the general thought of the book than the common one which refers it to the fickleness of the people in deserting an old king to pay court to his heir). This also is vanity and vexation of spirit.

It is not until the beginning of the fifth chapter that this perplexity begins to be cleared up, when the preacher turns his attention from the actual state of the world as presented by experience to the thought of God, the ruler over all. The abruptness of the transition shows that the author is entering on a new phase of thought. The idea of God's judgment, which had previously been suggested but for a moment, to be checked by a new form of doubt, becomes now the prominent feature of the argument; and, notwithstanding some occasional interruption of the earlier strain, is from this point pursued steadily to the end, to culminate in the grand conclusion, "Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." God is no longer regarded, as in the earlier train of thought, as the mere author of an immutable course of nature, little more than a personification of order and destiny. He now comes forth with the full attributes of personality, as a moral Governor, as a Being, standing in immediate relation to man; the object of his worship, of his prayers, of his vows, of his obedience. Precepts for the reverent worship of God, exhortations to fear and obedience, denunciations of a future judgment, now take the place of general acknowledgments of what God has given to man, or what He has ordained in the world. The world is no more regarded as a mere recurring cycle of phenomena, of which man and his desti-

nies form a part. In the midst of a physical order which God has appointed, there is clearly recognized the existence of a moral disorder opposed to His will and amenable to His judgment. Man becomes invested with the higher privilege, and, at the same time with a more awful responsibility. He is no longer the mere passive subject of good or evil fortune, placed in the midst of a system which he is unable to control and subject to a fate which he is unable to avert; he stands in the midst of these things, forming part of them indeed on the mere physical side of his nature, but distinguished from them on the moral side; a free agent, capable at his own wish of good and evil, and accountable to God, as he shall choose the one or the other. He is no longer driven by the mere impulse of his natural desires to seek for his own gratification and to find it vanity. He is permitted indeed to take his share in those enjoyments which God's goodness has bountifully provided for His creatures; but it is with the solemn warning that he must hold himself accountable to God, for the manner in which he enjoys them; that his desires may be gratified only so far as God's law sanctions the gratification. "Rejoice, O young man in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the way of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."

Here, then, is the beginning at least of man's deliverance from the vanity to which the creature is made subject; in that he is taught to regard himself as a person not as a thing, as an agent not as a mere patient, not merely, like the material universe, the work of God, but made in God's image, invested with God's attribute of personality and free will, standing in an especial relation to God as a person to a person, the moral servant of a moral governor; capable of obedience or disobedience; a being, not of this world only, but of a world to come. The beginning, I say, for even to the wisest of men under the elder dispensation, it was not given to discern the fuller import of that vanity so sadly manifested on the face of creation. Through doubt and darkness, not having received the

promises, but having seen them afar off, the preacher is but feeling his way to a partial solution of that problem which faintly illustrated by the record of man's fall, is more fully brought to light by the record of his redemption. A deeper import remained yet to be given to his bitter complaint of the vanity of all things, in the lesson of the later revelation, that the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption with the glorious liberty of the children of God; (Rom. 8:20, 21) in that yet future vision of a new heaven and a new earth, when the first heaven and the first earth are passed away, (Rev. 21:1) which not only connects the sore travail and fruitless labor which the preacher beheld with the curse pronounced upon the earth for man's transgression, but intimates that in some mysterious manner, as yet unknown to us, that frame of nature which mourned with man in his fall shall rejoice with him in his recovery.

If there be any person at the present time (and doubtless there are and in every age have been many such) who, like Solomon in this book, have felt their minds perplexed and their hearts troubled by the contemplation of the existence of irregularity and evil in the spiritual world coupled with the evidences of fixed order and unbroken law in the natural world there is a popular form of the philosophy of the day which is ready to supply them with a much simpler solution of their doubts. There is no real anomaly we are told in the coexistence of physical law with moral evil; for in truth there is no such coexistence at all: the existence of the law proves the non-existence of the evil. Actions may have their consequences more or less painful or inconvenient; and a wise man will, as a matter of course, do his utmost to avert those consequences, as he will endeavor to arrest the progress of a conflagration or a pestilence; but beyond this there is no more sin, no more violation of God's law in any human action, than there is in the fact that fire consumes property or sickness destroys life. One and the same law governs all things in

the moral as well as in the material world; every event alike is the natural consequent of the circumstances under which it takes place; and while those circumstances remain the same, no other result is possible. The law of cause and effect; the invariable succession of antecedent and consequent furnishes the rule and the explanation of all phenomena alike, whether of a physical or a moral character; the regular alternations of day and night; the fluctuating successions of sunshine and shower; the virtuous acts of the good man; the vicious self-indulgence of the profligate, are all instances of one and the same law, differing only, or rather seeming to differ, in the sight of man, in proportion as he is familiar with or ignorant of the accompanying and determining circumstances.

The question, by the answer to which this philosophy must stand or fall, is neither more nor less than this— (This philosophy has recently spoken out in very plain language indeed; and it is well that it has done so; for under such language there is no concealment of its character and no danger of misrepresenting its tendencies. We are now told, and the language is not that of a hostile critic, but of an advocate and opponent of the theory) that “our accountability or responsibility consists in the consequences of our actions, which are pleasurable or painful as they are right or wrong, that is, as they tend to benefit or injure ourselves or society.” It is for the moralist, adds the writer, “to guard, and if necessary, to increase, those pains and pleasures; and as man necessarily seeks that which is pleasurable and avoids that which is painful, the interests of morality are sufficiently assured.” “But,” he continues, “if all actions are the same *per se*, and could not possibly have been otherwise under the circumstances, what have we to preach about? What becomes of sin and iniquity, &c.? All that may be safely buried; and all we have to do in morals as in physics, is to show the consequences of our actions. The laws of morality are as fixed and determined and unvarying as are those that keep the planets in their sphere.” (Bray *On Force*, 1866, p. 43). Mr. Bray’s premises rest on higher authority than his own; and these premises

once granted, the conclusion is irresistible. Then Mr. Mill says, "A volition is a moral effect, which follows the corresponding moral causes as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow their physical causes. Whether it must do so, I acknowledge myself to be entirely ignorant, be the phenomena moral or physical; and condemn accordingly the word necessity, as applied to either case. All that I know is, that it always *does*." . . . *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, p. 501.

I attach no value to the use of the *term necessity*—in either application, (though Mr. Mill (p. 442) says that the assailants of his doctrine cannot do without the association engendered by the double meaning of this word). Omitting the word altogether, I simply assert that if moral effects follow moral causes as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow physical causes, there the moral agent is no more responsible for his acts, and no more transgresses God's law than the physical agent. If a thief steals my property under as certain a law as the fire burns it, the thief no more breaks God's law than does the fire. Mr. Bray's conclusion is inevitable if we admit Mr. Mill's premises.

It is well, I repeat, that this philosophy has spoken out so plainly, that all men may clearly see the vital importance of the issue involved. The question is neither more nor less than this: Is man capable of sin against God? No doubt under the influence of certain forces he may do actions injurious or inconvenient to other men; and other men may bring counter-acting forces to bear upon him, which may change his course of actions; but this is no more than is also true of the brute creation following their natural instincts; and the plain lesson of the whole teaching is this—that an evil man, following his own lusts, however injurious he may be to society, is no more a transgressor of God's law than an unruly horse or a savage dog; the exhortation of the preacher, "fear God and keep His commandments," is in this case a mere empty sound; for God has given no other commands than the laws which He has imposed on the planets in their courses, on the vegetable and animal creation in their

growth and decay; and these are laws which cannot be broken.

The conflict between a believing and unbelieving philosophy is now reduced to a very definite issue. The possibility of any religious relation whatever between God and man depends upon the answer given to one question: Has man, or has he not, a free will? Has he, at the moment of doing an action, the power to abstain from doing it, or are his actions, like the phenomena of the natural world, the inevitable effects of the forces in action, the power to abstain from doing it, or are his actions, like the phenomena of the natural world, the inevitable effects of the forces in action at the moment? The same weapon which has long been wielded against the branches of our religious belief is now directed against the root; and it is well that we should learn that root and branches are connected together as one whole, sprung from the same soil, pervaded by the same life; that the destruction of a part is virtually the destruction of the whole. We have long been told that miracles are impossible because the course of nature is unchangeable; that prayer in a time of pestilence, or drought is useless, because the course of nature is unchangeable: we are told at last that because the course of nature is unchangeable, there is no such thing as sin.

I say the *course* and not the laws of nature, though the latter is the form in which the objection is most frequently stated; and I do so because the course and not the law is the real point, on which the question turns; and because the objection has no real force unless the latter term is used in the sense of the former. The real question is simply this: when a conscious agent, whether human or superhuman brings about by his personal action a phenomena which would not have taken place without that action, is his interposition a voluntary act from which he might have refrained, or is it part of a fixed series of forces, which have been preordained and determined from the beginning of things? The electrician sends up his kite into the thunder-cloud, and diverts the lightning into a new course. Does he act as free man, or as a

necessary link in a chain of antecedents and consequents? If the former be admitted, we have clear evidence that the interposition of a personal will, though not violating the *laws* of nature, may at least exercise an appreciable influence on the succession of *events*; and if so, there is nothing in the course of nature to preclude the possible interposition of a higher Will with a similar though greater influence. If the latter be conceded, we have reduced human actions under the same law with merely material phenomena; but with the inevitable result, that man is no more responsible for his acts than the sea is responsible for the ebb and flow of its tides.

It is easy to construct a theory of beautiful simplicity, if we are at liberty to leave out of consideration all the facts that are inconsistent with it. The fact that man is conscious of a power to refrain—is a fact as certain, guaranteed by as direct an experience as that he sees or hears, or is cognisant by his senses of any of the material phenomena on which the inductions of science are based. With this fact is directly connected all that makes man a being capable of religion—the sense of duty, the conviction of sin, the anticipation of immortality, the fear of judgment. Admit this fact, and we have a basis on which we may successfully rear the superstructure of our faith. Deny this fact, and it is no passing delusion of scepticism, but a sad and painful truth, that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity. But let it never be forgotten that this freedom of man's will is a fact and not a theory; that it no more needs a philosophical proof than the fact that a man sees with his eyes or that he hears with his ears; that it is not affected by the strength or weakness of the reasonings which have at times been adduced in its support; for, as an immediate fact of consciousness, it is prior to and above all reasoning.

The time will not permit me now to treat this momentous question with the fulness with which it ought to be treated; but I feel it my duty at this time to declare my deep conviction that of all the conflicts which belief has to wage with unbelief, this, in which the very possibility

of all religion and of all morality is concerned, is the most important and the most vital. The conviction of individual freedom, of the distinction between a person and a thing, is coeval with the creation and coextensive with the spread of the human race; it is a conviction planted by God in the hearts of men to the end that they should fear Him; and no device of man's invention will finally prevail against it. But while the victory of truth is certain as regards the human race, the temporary seductions of error may triumph fatally over the individual. It is no light peril to any man, or to any generation of men (especially to those who have the ardent passions and the eager credulity of growth) when a science so real, so successful, so beneficial within her own province—a science flushed with her triumphs over the material world, with the trophies of her victories emblazoned on the face of the starry heavens above our heads, and rooted in the depths of the earth beneath our feet, seems to come forth and tell us, not indeed by the mouth of her truest and most genuine disciples, but by many who lay claim to the title and share in the glory, that it is her last and greatest triumph to have brought the moral no less than the physical universe into subjection to her laws, to have discovered that the being to whose commanding intellect and energetic will all those triumphs are owing, is himself but one of the material phenomena which his knowledge traced out and his power moulded to his own purpose. There are minds to whom this spurious abnegation of personality seems to have somewhat of the grandeur of a moral self-denial; there are minds to whom the very paradox has a charm from the ingenuity which it calls forth to maintain it; there are minds to whom it seems a mark of superiority to run counter to the voice of human nature and to triumph over the prejudices of the race; above all, there are those who will eagerly catch at the practical consequence which some of the teachers may disclaim, but which the doctrine too certainly and logically carries with it for any disclaimer to counteract—that acts which are determined by necessary laws must be morally indifferent; that God who ordained those laws

cannot be displeased with the effects of His own ordinances; that man, the subject of material laws alone, determined in his actions as surely and inevitably as the falling body by its weight or the brute beast by its instincts, has, like them, no other course before him than to yield to the impulses and gratify the desires of the passing moment.

The record of the doubts and struggles through which the royal preacher painfully wrought his way, from the conception of man as a creature made for enjoyment to that of man as a moral agent subject to a law of duty—form the maxim. "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labors," (Ch. 2:26) to the precept, "Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man," (Ch. 12:13)—is a record of the voice of God's Spirit speaking in the heart of man through the moral nature which He has implanted in him, testifying to the individual by the virtues of conscience, as He testifies to the Church by the word of the Apostles, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (John 1:8). The capacity of enjoyment man shares with the brute, the attributes of utility, he shares not with the brute only, but with the herb of the field and the metal of the mine, and every product of nature which he can employ for his own purposes: in the consciousness of duty, in the power to choose between right and wrong, he stands alone upon the earth; it is the one prerogative of man as man: his one fearful responsibility, his one glorious pre-eminence. Through this alone he fell in Adam. Through this alone he is redeemed in Christ.

Alliance, Ohio.

ARTICLE IV.

MILLENNIAL DAWN, OR RUSSELLISM.

BY REV. GRAYSON Z. STUP, A.M., B.D.

The doctrines of this modern heresy emanate from the fertile brain of Charles Taze Russell, formerly of Allegheny, Pa., now of Brooklyn, N. Y. He is not a graduate in theology, nor of the associated sciences, but he has the presumption to arrogate to himself the title of "Pastor," and reposes as the shepherd and bishop of the "Little Flock," one of the pet phrases of his writings. In the past decade he and his teachings have reached over a wide area. He is a great advertiser and traveler, and has made use of every device known to modern methods of publicity to get before the public. At first he established his own publishing concern known as Zion's Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. Later, associated with this as interlocking corporations, so that it is difficult to discover which is which, came the International Bible Students' Association, the Brooklyn Tabernacle work, the Pastor Russell Lecture Bureau, the Bible and Tract Society of England. The most pretentious and fundamental publication is entitled "Studies in the Scriptures," and consists of six volumes, viz., Series I, "The Plan of the Ages"; Series II, "The Time is at Hand"; Series III, "Thy Kingdom Come"; Series IV, "The Day of Vengeance"; Series V, "The At-one-ment between God and Man"; Series VI, "The New Creation." These rather bulky volumes contain over three thousand pages.

In the summer of 1912, W. T. Ellis made a careful investigation of the workings of Russellism and reports the following in "The Continent" of that year. "The latest report of the allied societies presents . . . a really astounding record of results achieved. It records a total of 22,838,282 tracts distributed within the preceding twelve months. During the year 1911 more than half a million volumes of "Studies in the Scriptures" were circulated,

bringing the total circulation of the books up to more than 4,000,000 copies. It may be mentioned that the publications are in twelve languages. During the year 221,789 letters were dispatched from the Brooklyn headquarters and 128,712 received. Six hundred colporteurs were responsible for much of the extension of literature, although "Pastor Russell says he is still not satisfied. The colporteur work is self-sustaining." In 1915 forty-seven million copies of "free volunteer matter" were sent out. Since 1914 there has been a falling-off of donations, and retrenchment has been ordered along all lines. The failure of his prophecy has affected his income.

The question naturally presents itself, How did this man get so much power? There are just two reasons in reply. First, he had something that tickled the itching ears of some people and appealed to the vanity of the deceitful human heart, and, secondly, he had the means at hand to put it before the public. Before we look at the first reason we shall consider the second. And this naturally leads us to look at his biography. He was brought up a Presbyterian and worked in his father's haberdashery in Pittsburgh. His ingratiating manner made him a good salesman, and he built up the business until there were soon five stores. In the meantime his alert, investigating mind was inquiring into the religious realm. Literature on chiliasm and the "second chance" turned him entirely away from the extreme position of Calvinism, and he went to the other extreme and became a fanatic in advocating his newly discovered views on the millennium. He decided to give up the more prosaic life of business, and enter the more attractive sphere of prophecy and religious propaganda.

His prosperous business afforded him the financial nucleus necessary to begin publishing his tracts, and this was supplemented by resources which his wife put into his hands. Nor did he neglect business to be a preacher. It is said that he was ever adventuring into larger fields of financial operation—real estate, oil properties, mines and stocks—"he was a good business man, but rather sharp." The "Brooklyn Eagle," in answering the com-

plaint of Pastor Russell, when he sued it for \$100,000 libel and lost, showed that many persons, converted to his views, turned over their property to him outright, with the assurance that they would receive an annuity as long as they lived; others made wills bequeathing their properties to him. "Much of the money that has been received by plaintiff in this way has been invested in real estate, mining stocks and various speculative enterprises, the investments having been made in the name of dummy corporations, partnerships and associations, or through other persons acting as secret representatives or dummies for plaintiff. Plaintiff's said operations have extended until they cover every State in the United States as well as many countries in Europe."

Some of his methods of high finance brought him into public condemnation. One of these was his "Cemetery Scheme." We quote the following from the "Brooklyn Eagle": "Pastor Russell, who has always been counted a good judge of Pittsburgh real estate, a few years ago discovered a plot of ground.....just beyond the city limits, that appealed to him as admirably adapted for cemetery purposes. He figured that there was a good opening for a cemetery in Pittsburgh, and was looking for a plot of ground to get one started. The property was purchased for \$27,000 by the treasurer of the People's Pulpit Association, but as this man was pretty well known in Pittsburgh as a Russellite, it was not deemed wise for him to hold title to the property. Very shortly after acquiring the property it was sold for \$30,000 to the United States Investment Company. This investment company is a dummy corporation to which Pastor Russell transferred a lot of oil stocks, mining stocks and other property at about the time his wife was trying to collect the alimony awarded her by the courts. Some of the transfers which were made at this time the courts declared 'in fraud upon his wife.' "

From this investment company the Rosemount, Mount Hope, and Evergreen United Cemeteries bought the land, which thus lost all direct association with Pastor Russell's name. Through some of his friends and followers

four eminent Pittsburgh clergymen, who were hostile to Russell, were persuaded to lend their names to the cemetery project. In some way not clearly defined this cemetery was supposed to benefit poor people. It was soon discovered that the United States Investment Company held control over the Cemeteries Corporation, and that the real manipulator was Pastor Russell who collected the income. It is said that the aforesaid Pittsburgh clergymen never attended any of the meetings of the trustees and soon withdrew from the scheme.

Another of his methods for getting big money is shown by the sale of "Miracle Wheat." It was the articles in the "Brooklyn Eagle," exposing the "Miracle Wheat" and associating Pastor Russell by one of its cartoons with the crooks of Union Bank in its schemes of high finance, that caused the Pastor to bring suit for libel. The history of the case in brief is as follows: In June 1911, Pastor Russell, as editor and publisher, caused to be published in the "Watch Tower" the following advertisement:

"A Donation of Miracle Wheat."

"Brother Bohnet writes us that he has gradually accumulated a crop of miracle wheat from the few grains he obtained as a start. He prefers that the first opportunity for obtaining this wheat shall go to the "Watch Tower" readers. He will sell it for one dollar a pound, including postage, and give the entire proceeds to our society..... He says miracle wheat should be sowed one fourth as thick as common wheat. Ordinarily it should produce ten to fifteen times as much proportionately to the amount sown." This wheat was sold at the Brooklyn Tabernacle of which Pastor Russell is the head.

In the trial the testimony brought out the fact that the wheat had been grown on land owned by a concern that Russell controlled, and that it was offered for sale to his followers for \$60 a bushel, when the same article was sold elsewhere for \$5 a bushel. The yield of the wheat, as testified by Russellites, was from one to one and a half

times as much as the ordinary wheat, although it was advertised to yield from ten to fifteen times as much. By the testimony of a government expert the "Eagle" proved that "Miracle Wheat" was an ordinary seed wheat, no better and no worse than other seed wheats that sell at \$1 and \$2 a bushel. The sale was suddenly discontinued after the "Eagle's" articles appeared, but not before many people were duped into buying the wheat.

In addition to all his other financial schemes Russell has yearly donations from his followers which amounted to \$2,000,000 in ten years. Over all this money just three men have the oversight, Pastor Russell being the controlling factor in a whole series of interlocking corporations, through which he transacts his business and derives his income. In the "Watch Tower Society" there are 50,000 voting shares, (though there might be 500,000 if every one claimed his right), and Pastor Russell holds 47,000 of them. The president, vice-president, and secretary-treasurer are reported to keep a strict account among themselves, and no one has access to the books except them. In answer to a question by the court whether any one else ever went through their books to check up on expenditures, the reply was made, "No, sir. In a worldly sense, we are not responsible to any one for our expenditures. We are responsible only to God."

The facts have shown us the sly, shrewd financial operations of the author of *Millennial Dawn*. But in order to study in their true light the doctrines which he promulgates and which so many have espoused, it is necessary also to glance at his reputation and character. He was known in Pittsburgh as "the crank preacher," but his career was soon cut short there by proceedings for divorce. In 1879 he married Maria F. Ackley, but their life was not a happy one, because the wife alleges in her suit for divorce that soon after their marriage she found improper letters written to him by women whom he employed to sell his tracts, etc. Later matters grew worse, and serious improprieties were charged against the Pastor and women who worked with him. Following an understanding between himself and his congregation

Pastor Russell took a vow of which the following is one of the seven paragraphs: "And so far as reasonably possible, I will avoid being in the same room with any of the opposite sex alone, unless the door to the room stands wide open." In the proceeding for divorce it was alleged that about the year 1896 the Pastor stopped speaking to his wife, sulked in her presence, charged her in letters with being under the influence of Satan, contended that she was imbued with "Woman's Rights," called her a blasphemer, said she was not fit to be his wife, tried to show that she was weak-minded and wanted to put her in an asylum. When she was suffering with erysipelas in December 1896, he ordered her out of the room and, by the exposure, aggravated the attack until it spread all over her body, and endangered her life. There are many particulars which we might cite from the court records, but these will show the disposition of the man toward his own wife. Mrs. Russell won her suit and alimony was granted. Russell fought the decree for five years, carrying it up from the Court of Common Pleas to the Superior Court, and spent much money upon it. He was beaten in every one of his appeals. The Superior Court of Pennsylvania, in deciding against him, said: "His course of conduct toward his wife evidences such insistent egotism and extravagant self-praise that it would be manifest to the jury that his conduct toward her was one of continual arrogant domination that would necessarily render the life of any sensitive Christian woman a burden and make her condition intolerable."

In citing these facts, all of which are in public print and mostly on court records, we desire to say that it is not our purpose to hold the man up to the scorn of the world. But he is a public character, and has the presumption to set himself up as an infallible guide in Scriptural interpretation, and as a preacher of righteousness. He evidently feels justified in what he has done, for he has sought diligently through his periodical publications to justify himself before the public. It is only fair that those who review his teachings should set before their readers a sketch of the man's career. For, after all, it is

not so much what a man says as what he is that counts. But if both his character and teachings are violations of established standards of truth, it raises a serious suspicion as to the soundness of the doctrine he may propagate.

In writing a synopsis of the peculiar views of Pastor Russell it is necessary that, in a limited article, one dwell not too long upon the several points reviewed. We shall turn our attention only to the more prominent heretical doctrines.

HIS IDEA OF GOD.

He has the Jewish rather than the Christian idea of God. Jehovah of the Old Testament is his God. As Creator God only used the Logos as a spiritual agent, not as absolute Deity, in making the world. He is not a Trinitarian in any sense of the word. He would like to be classed as a monotheist, or Unitarian, though not with modern Unitarians. Nor would he be accepted by them. His theory of the atonement would bar him out. However, he is not a monotheist, but a polytheist, for he has many gods. Jesus of Nazareth, for his sacrifice, is rewarded by being given the divine nature in exchange for the human. And in like manner "the elect," the "little flock," will be exalted literally to the divine nature. In Vol. I, page 81, we read: "Thus the saints of this Gospel age are an anointed company—anointed to be kings and priests unto God, and together with Jesus, their chief and Lord, they constitute Jehovah's Anointed—the Christ." On page 196 we read: "This change of nature from human to divine is given as a reward to those who, within the Gospel age, sacrifice the *human nature*, as did our Lord, with all *its* interests, hopes and aims, present and future—even unto death." In Vol. V, page 166, we find: "The careful student of the preceding chapters has found abundant testimony from the Scriptures, to the effect that there is but one All-mighty God—Jehovah; and that he has highly exalted his First Begotten Son, his Only Begotten Son, to his own nature and to his own

throne of the universe; and that next to these in order of rank will be the glorified Church, the Bride, the Lamb's wife and joint-heir." Yet Russell would not make them co-equal and co-eternal with Jehovah, but as an assortment of demi-gods whom he calls spirit beings, and who occupy the same plane as the risen and glorified Jesus in the kingdom of heaven. He has interwoven Swedenborgian and Mormon conceptions into his idea of God. Jesus and the Holy Spirit are not divine in the sense in which orthodox Christianity has always understood their divinity. They are no part of Jehovah God as to essence and equality. They are created by-products of Russellism.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Christ Jesus had not two natures in this world as God's Word teaches, but only one—the human. In Vol. I, page 179, we find: "Neither was Jesus a combination of two natures, human and spiritual. The blending of two natures produces neither the one nor the other, but an imperfect, hybrid thing, which is obnoxious to the divine arrangement. When Jesus was in the flesh he was a perfect human being; previous to that time he was a perfect spiritual being; and since his resurrection he is a perfect spiritual being of the highest or divine order." On page 180: "Thus we see that in Jesus there was no mixture of natures, but that twice he experienced a change of nature; first. from spiritual to human; afterward, from human to the highest order of spiritual nature, the divine; and in each case the one was given up for the other." In these statements Russell has allied himself with the Arians who were condemned by the Council of Nicea in A. D. 325, but which transaction he ridicules as the scheme of Constantine, whom he calls the Trinity-maker. The Church has always repudiated the heresy that Christ was a mixture of two natures. The Council of Chalcedon in A. D. 451 was called for the very purpose of checking this heresy and stating the orthodox teaching of the Church on the two natures of Christ. Since then orthodox

Christians have believed that Christ Jesus had two natures, the divine and the human, and that they are unmixed, unchanged, indivisible, and inseparable in one glorious personality, the only begotten Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Russell either does not know what the Church teaches, or else he has deliberately slandered it with reference to one of its fundamental doctrines in order to make room for the promulgation of his own eccentric notions.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

According to Russell the Holy Spirit is not the third person of the Holy Trinity. In Vol. V, page 165, we read: "And equally consistent is the Scripture teaching respecting the Holy Spirit—that it is not another God, but the spirit, influence or power by the one God, our Father, and by his Only Begotten Son." "From the foregoing we perceive that a broad definition of the words 'Spirit of God,' or 'holy Spirit' would be—the divine will, influence, or power, exercised any and everywhere, and for any purpose in harmony with the divine will." Page 182. In speaking of the Holy Spirit as Comforter he says, page 204: "Nothing connected with this reference to the Holy Spirit as another comforter or helper or strengthener implies that another God is meant or another *person* of a trinity of Gods." "It should be remembered that the words he, him, himself, used in referring to the parakletos, might with equal propriety be translated she, her, herself, or it, itself." On the point of pronouns we refer to page 172: "Nor is it rare for things which are neuter of themselves to be designated as masculine or feminine, according as they are strong and active, or passive and delicate. Thus, for instance, the sun is universally referred to as 'he' and the moon as 'she.' Hence, if it were not for the general misconception on the subject, and the prevalent thought that the Holy Spirit is a person....there could be no criticism made of the use of the masculine pronouns in respect to the Holy Spirit; because God is recognized as masculine,

as the Author and source of life and blessing." This is a sample of his exegesis, and shows what an outlaw he is in the realm of Scriptural interpretation. He is no Greek scholar. He resorts to a Diaglott translation as the nearest approach to the meaning of the original. He disregards all the recognized laws of exegesis, and becomes a law unto himself. How inaccurate he is is shown by the statement that the sun is universally referred to as "he" and the moon as "she." How about the Germans, who say "die Sonne" and "der Mond"? Here we have the genders reversed, and the sun is "she" and the moon "he." But then the Germans always have been hard to manage! In this inaccurate way he seeks to govern the translation of one language by the usages of another. The inspired writers knew how to write Greek, and the great scholars of every generation since know how to translate it, and for such an upstart to prate about these sacred matters in such brazen impertinence is enough to stir up the righteous indignation of any loyal servant of the true God.

That Russell saw a hard task before him in eliminating the divinity of the Holy Spirit is shown by the fact that he devotes nearly 140 pages to the subject. (Vol. V. pages 162-300). Most of his argument is devoted to the passages in which the work of the Holy Spirit is described. In all of these he distorts and perverts every trace of personality usually understood by readers of the original, native, plain, simple language of Scripture, and, by juggling his pen, he turns out a cold impersonal force without any of the lovely attributes of personality. We cite but one of these proof-texts and his method of treatment. "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come He will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment." John 16:8. On page 291 he says: "We now examine this text, used by some as a proof that the Holy Spirit operates *in* sinners for their reformation. We contend that such a view is wholly incorrect,—that the Scriptures, rightly understood, teach that the Holy Spirit is granted only to the consecrated believers; that it is not given to unbelievers and consequently could not

operate in them after the manner generally claimed." By his interpretation the office and work of the Holy Spirit are entirely misrepresented. He is not to call, enlighten and quicken sinners, but only influence justified believers. His special work is to take the "little flock" and polish them, so that they may be elevated to the divine nature. It is not the proper time now for sinners to be saved. It is even useless for them to pray. It avails nothing. It will be more fitting for them to pray in the millennium. It is simply astounding to know how far this distorter of Scriptures dares to set forth his pernicious views, and especially so when we realize how many serious, earnest souls he has led into apostasy.

MAN.

A few quotations will show his views of man. In Vol. V, page 307, he says: "Accepting the standard definition of the word 'animal'—'a sentient living organism,' we need have no hesitation in classing man as one of and the chief and king over earth's animals." "Examining this question from the Bible standpoint we will find that man *has* a body and *has* a spirit, but *is* a soul." "The word 'soul,' as found in the Scriptures, signifies *sentient being*, that is, a being possessed of powers of sense, sense-perception. With minds freed from prejudice, let us go with this definition to the Genesis account of man's creation, and note that (1) the organism or body was formed; (2) the *spirit* of life, called 'breath of life,' was communicated; (3) living soul, or sentient being, resulted. This is very simple and easily understood. It shows that the body is not the soul, nor is the spirit or breath of life the soul, but that when these two were united by the Lord, the resultant quality or condition was living man, living being—a living soul, possessed of perceptive powers." Pages 322, 323. "In full accord with this we now call attention to a fact which will surprise many, viz., that according to the Scriptural account every dog is a soul, every horse is a soul, every cow is a soul, every bird and fish are souls. That is to say, these are all sentient

creatures, possessed of powers of sense-perception." Page 323.

This is psychology with a vengeance! But has the Pastor noted that in the Genesis account it is said only of Adam that "man became a living soul"? It was not said of any other grades of creatures. But man was made in the image and likeness of his Maker, and the soul of man is a far higher organism of sense-perception than the "soul of a dog." The word *neh-phesh* not only means "living being," but it means "mind or soul"—"the seat of the rational life." The Century Dictionary gives six definitions for soul, all of which are descriptive of psychical experiences of *man*. No reference whatever to the *brute*. The first in order speaks of the soul as a "substantial entity believed to be that in each person which lives, feels, thinks, and wills." This is the general usage, but Russell juggles with the word until he finds a restricted meaning, and one that is not used except by those who have a theory to maintain. And why does he speak thus of the human soul? Because if man *has* a soul, a substantial entity that lives in the body, and knows, reasons, wills, and remembers, it is hard to believe in soul-sleep and annihilation, which are pet themes with the Pastor. He says the soul dies in death. Man's death and the death of a brute he makes the same.

"THE DIVINE PLAN OF THE AGES."

Russell has drafted a chart, which is bound in the front of Series I of "Studies in the Scriptures," by which he endeavors to show his conception of God's plan for redeeming humanity. This ingenious chart he has divided into three dispensations. The first extends from creation to the flood and was "under the supervision and special ministration of angels, who were permitted to try what they could do to recover the fallen and degenerate race." Vol. I, page 220. The second extends from the flood to the commencement of the millennium in 1874, to which he gives the general title "Present Evil World," and which is divided into three sub-ages—the patriarchal,

the Jewish, and the Gospel. The third great dispensation is the "Fulness of Times," and is made up of the Millennial Age and the "Ages to Come." The millennial age is to be a "great reconstruction period. Associated with Christ Jesus in that Reign will be the Church, his bride, his body, even as he promised, saying, 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. Rev. 3:21.'" Page 222. By such literal interpretation of Scripture he lays the foundation for his most enticing doctrine, namely, that by good works men may win position in God's Kingdom. His whole chart is shrewdly worked out by the use of planes and pyramids to illustrate his notion of the plan of salvation, and whoever has accepted his plan has furnished tribute to his cause.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

He has much to say about the kingdom of God. But it is not a present reality. It is all in the future. Heirship in the spiritual phase of the kingdom was the only offer made in the Gospel age. After paraphrasing that wonderful talk of Jesus with Nicodemus, he concludes: "As the wind blows here and there, you cannot see it, though it exerts an influence all about you. You know not whence it comes and where it goes. This is as good an illustration as I can give you of those born of the spirit in the resurrection, those who will 'enter into' or constitute the kingdom which I am now preaching. They will all be as invisible as the wind, and men, not born of the spirit, will neither know whence they come nor whither they go." Vol. I, page 280. The nominal church has nothing to do with the kingdom of God. In the Gospel age the "little flock" is being selected to reign when the real kingdom is to be set up at the second coming of Christ. The nominal church system was "spewed out" in 1878.

There will be two phases of the kingdom of God—a spiritual or heavenly, and an earthly or human phase.

The overcoming saints of the Gospel age constitute the spiritual phase. Theirs is the first resurrection, and through them all others are to be blessed. "The great work before this glorious anointed company necessitates their exaltation to the divine nature. No other than divine power could accomplish it." Page 288. The work of the earthly phase of the kingdom will be confined to this world and to humanity. Those who will do this work are the Old Testament saints, whose judgment day was before the Gospel age. He literally applies Christ's words to this phase of his scheme: "Ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God." In the millennium they shall work among men on earth until the race is saved, and then they shall shine forth before their fellowmen, and Christ, and the angels as the "stars forever and ever." But great as will be the accumulating glory of those perfect men who will constitute the earthly phase of the kingdom, the glory of the heavenly will be 'the glory that excelleth.' While the former will shine as the stars forever, the latter will shine as the brightness of the firmament—the sun." Page 292. He never lets the "little flock" lose sight of the fact that they are going to be at the top of glory. It is perfectly entrancing, if one can believe his ravings, to think of what one may become, if he be an "overcomer" here. Surely, Russell must begrudge the Almighty His glory and honor and power, for he is constantly exalting the "little flock" to the fulness of the God-head bodily. He belittles God and magnifies man. He is constantly appealing to the subtle ambitions of men, affirming that by sacrifice and service they will win the divine nature. It was the same appeal to human vanity that led to asceticism and courted martyrdom. The prize was a better resurrection. So in this. One woman said to me: "I want to be one of the 144,000 to help rule over the rest of the world."

THE ATONEMENT.

The life of Jesus was not an incarnation. Before birth he was a created spirit. In conception he dropped

the spirit nature and took the human. The death of Jesus was, therefore, that of a man and nothing more. He paid the penalty of Adam's transgression and purchased the right of redemption for the race. But he suffered only as a creature. As a reward for the sacrifice of the human nature he was given the divine in the resurrection. He was raised a spirit being of the highest type with a divine nature. On page 107, Vol. II, we read: "We must bear in mind, also, that our Lord is no longer a human being; that as a human being he gave Himself a ransom for man, having become a man for that very purpose." On page 129 he says: "If Christ's body was resurrected, it would prove that our redemption price was taken back, for Jesus said, 'My flesh I will give for the life of the world.' It was his flesh, his life as a man, his humanity, that was sacrificed for our redemption." This is a fearful degradation of the sublime sacrifice of God's only begotten Son, the Lamb of God. Paul says: "Feed the flock of God which He hath purchased with His own blood." Here the divine nature bleeds along with the human. But the empty tomb must be accounted for, so we read, page 129: "Our Lord's human body was, however, supernaturally removed from the tomb; because had it remained there it would have been an insurmountable obstacle to the faith of the disciples. . . . We know nothing about what became of it, except that it did not decay or corrupt. . . . Whether it was dissolved into gases or whether it is still preserved somewhere as the grand memorial of God's love, of Christ's obedience, and of our redemption, no one knows." This caps the climax for falsehood and stubborn unbelief. By such audacious juggling with historical facts has he sought to rob Christianity of its vital doctrine, the literal, bodily resurrection from the grave. It is a blasphemous slander. (See Luke 24:36-40).

His teaching is a modification of the Moral Influence Theory. Jesus won the favor of God by his perfect obedience and, in dying, purchased the right to set men free. But they must overcome as he did. They gain salvation

by imitating Jesus. The work of atonement cannot be accomplished until the "little flock" has all been selected.

In Vol V, page 29, he says: "Nor can this work of atonement, so far as mankind is concerned, be accomplished instantaneously and by faith." "This great work of the Mediator has appropriated to it the entire millennial age." This sounds strange. We thought when Jesus said: "It is finished," that the atonement was complete, and man had only to believe on Jesus to be saved. But Russell has put At-one-ment for atonement frequently, and when so used he refers to the extent of the atonement and not to its efficacy.

THE OFFER OF SALVATION.

Salvation is freely offered to all, but not now. He has a peculiar theory of election. During the Gospel age a certain class is called to special favor and to whom special promises are made. In Vol. I, page 72, he says of the Gospel: "It has not converted nations—it was not designed to do so in this age, but it has elected here and there some, in all a "little flock"to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom in an age to follow this." "The witnessing to the world during this age is a secondary object." Page 92. The Russellites seem to contradict this by their practice, for they are compassing sea and land to make proselytes to the "little flock."

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The attitude of Russellism toward foreign missions is seen on page 178, Vol. III. "Experience has surely proved that the bungling arguments of sectarianism, whose errors distort and vitiate what truth they possess, seldom make converts of either honest or scoffing skeptics. Surely, all but the blind can see that if the *ten hundred millions* of heathendom were converted to the condition of the *four hundred millions* of so-called Christendom, the question would be an open one whether

they would not be two-fold more fit for destruction than they were in their original heathen superstitions." Russell has done everything possible to prejudice people against foreign missions. When a world's inspection tour was planned by sixty-six laymen, under the campaign of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, Russell, who is an opportunist, gathered several of his followers together and visited a few ports of the world, spending a few hours in a place, or a day or so in a country, and then, when the sixty-six laymen returned after months of travel and study, and announced the date of the great rally in New York where reports were to be made, Russell was waiting for them, advertised along the same lines, but gave it out as the result of the investigation of the mission fields by the Laymen's Missionary Committee that foreign missions were a failure, that the missionaries were unable to reach the people, and that the people did not want the Gospel. The authentic report from the sixty-six laymen gave a different story, and since that time the work of foreign missions has been growing by leaps and bounds.

BEGINNING OF THE MILLENNIUM.

Russell makes an arbitrary assumption that the millennium began in 1874. In Vol. II, page 39, he says: "Here we furnish the evidence that from the creation of Adam to A. D. 1873, was six thousand years." Yet in producing the evidence he makes a discrepancy of 124 years more than Usher's chronology, in order to make the millennium begin in 1874. But not only does he differ with Usher, Dr. Geikie, in "Hours with the Bible," gives a list of fourteen other chronologists from whom Russell differs widely. "There can be no ground for dogmatizing where doctors differ so strikingly for he would be a bold man who would impugn the soundness of the worthies who offer even the highest computations quoted." Yet Russell brushes them all aside and claims he is right by his own ipse dixit. He simply begs the question.

Next he argues that as Israel's law gave to them six

days for weary toil and the seventh day for rest and refreshment, so the seventh millennium would be the great time of restitution in which Christ would reign. The "times of the Gentiles" were to be fulfilled during the first forty years of the millennium, beginning with 1874 and ending with 1914. In Vol. II, pages 76-78, we find: "In this chapter we present the Bible evidence proving that the full end of the times of the Gentiles, i. e., the full end of their lease of dominion, will be reached in A. D. 1914; and that that date will be the farthest limit of the rule of imperfect men. And be it observed, that if this is shown to be a fact firmly established by the Scriptures, it will prove:

Firstly, That at that date the kingdom of God....will obtain full, universal control, and that it will then be 'set up,' or firmly established, in the earth, on the ruins of present institutions.

Secondly, It will prove that he whose right it is thus to take the dominion will then be present as earth's new Ruler.....

Thirdly, It will prove that some time before the end of 1914 the last member of the divinely recognized Church of Christ....will be glorified with the Head; because every member is to reign with Christ, being a joint-heir with him of the kingdom, and it cannot be 'set up' without every member.

Fourthly, It will prove that from that time forward Jerusalem shall no longer be trodden down of the Gentiles, but shall arise from the dust of divine disfavor, to honor.....

Fifthly, It will prove that by that date, or sooner, Israel's blindness will begin to be turned away.....

Sixthly, It will prove that the great 'time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation,' will reach its culmination in a world-wide reign of anarchy.....

Seventhly, It will prove that before that date God's kingdom, organized in power, will be in the earth and then smite and crush the Gentile image."

Now these strong statements just quoted put Pastor Russell in a dilemma; for he says that if he proves from

Scripture that the "times of the Gentiles" be fulfilled in 1914, then the aforesaid prophecies would come true. Now they have not come true. Either Pastor Russell did not prove his point and is therefore not a safe interpreter of Scriptures, or else his prophecy is a failure.

THE RESURRECTION IN 1878.

"The spring of A. D. 1878 . . . marks the date when the nominal church systems were 'spewed out' . . . and from which time they are not the mouthpieces of God, nor in any degree recognized by him." Vol. II, page 235. All these dates he has worked out by a theory of certain parallelisms of type and antitype. And he claims to be quite correct in his reckonings and deductions. "For be it distinctly noticed that if the chronology, or any of these time-periods, be changed but one year, the beauty and force of this parallelism are destroyed." Page 243. According to these words his whole plan was to work out with the precision of a clock. On the basis of such calculation he figures out the resurrection.

"To learn the date at which our Lord began the exercise of his power would therefore be to discover the time when his sleeping saints were awakened to life and glory. And to do this we have but to recall the parallelism of the Jewish and Gospel dispensations. Looking back to the type, we see that in the spring of A. D. 33, three and a half years after the beginning of the Jewish harvest (A. D. 29), our Lord typically took unto himself his power and exercised kingly authority. (See Matt. 21:5-15). And evidently the only object of that action was to mark a parallel point of time in this harvest, when he would in reality assume the kingly office, power, etc.; viz., in the spring of 1878, three and a half years after his second advent at the harvest period, in the fall of 1874. The year 1878 being thus indicated as the date when the Lord began to take unto himself his great power, it is reasonable to conclude that there the setting up of the kingdom began, the first step of which would be the deliverance of

his body, the Church, among whom the sleeping members are to take precedence."

"We hold that it is a most reasonable inference, and one in perfect harmony with all the Lord's plan, that in the spring of 1878 all the holy apostles and other 'overcomers' of the Gospel age who slept in Jesus were raised spirit beings, like unto their Lord and Master. And while we, therefore, conclude that their resurrection is now an accomplished fact, and hence that they as well as the Lord are present in the earth, the fact that we do not see them is no obstacle to faith when we remember that, like their Lord, they are now spirit beings, and like him, invisible to men." Vol. III, page 233, 234. All this seems quite intangible for ordinary mortals to combat. So we will quote two brief passages from the Pastor, which together with Father Time, will prove his prophecy a failure. In Vol. IV, page 625, we read: "The beginning of the earthly phase of the kingdom in the end of A. D. 1914 will, we understand, consist wholly of the resurrected holy ones of olden time,—from John the Baptist back to Abel." They will be *perfect men*, having completely restored to them all that was lost in Adam of mental and moral likeness to God, and perfection of physical powers." Page 626. Those great worthies should have already come within the vision of the people living in 1916. Again he says on page 622, "The kingdom of God must first be set up before its influence and work will result in the complete destruction of the 'powers that be' of 'this present evil world'—political, financial, ecclesiastical—by the close of the 'Times of the Gentiles,' October A. D. 1914." The strongest refutation of his argument is the fact that the old wicked world is still here with its politics, finances, and churches. Russell tried to prove too much, and it has come back at him, branding him as the false prophet we always thought he was.

THE JUDGMENT.

The millennium is the great judgment day of the world. His idea of the judgment brings us to his theory of resto-

ration, or the "second chance." The ante-diluvians had their judgment day before the flood; the patriarchs, prophets and Jews had theirs in the Jewish age; the Gospel age has passed judgment upon its inhabitants. The "little flock" have been judged perfect and should by this time be sitting upon the etherial throne as divine beings, helping to judge the rest of the world. "All were sentenced to death because of Adam's disobedience, and all will enjoy (in this life or the next) a *full opportunity* to gain everlasting life under the favorable terms of the New Covenant." "If any one calls this a second chance, let him do so." "Men, not God, have limited to the Gospel age this chance or opportunity of attaining life." Vol. I, page 130, 131. Thus boldly does he state his case. Yet God has very positively fixed the time as *now* and *here* to be saved. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." 2 Cor. 6:2. And in Rev. 22:11, 12 we find: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." "And behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." Yet Russell says that the wicked world is to be restored from the dead, and given a second trial on this earth as human beings. If any one does not improve in a hundred years he will be cut off, but if they show a desire to be better, they will be "gradually trained, educated and disciplined, until they reach perfection," when they will exchange the human for the divine nature. Those who are cut off enter the second death—extinction. For such wild speculation he has not the slightest support in the Word of God, and by teaching it he has appealed to the vanity of some, and the most depraved notions of others, making sinners feel secure in their godlessness, and removing the moral restraints of accountability which hold many evil-doers in check.

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

Russell has great rewards for his followers, but not in this world. They must sacrifice here so that, by their

good works, they may win the highest heaven in "the ages to come." There is no place of punishment for the wicked. Annihilation is their penalty. Russell maintains that Sheol, Hades, and hell all mean the grave and nothing else. But in Luke 16:23 Hades describes the condition of suffering ascribed to the lost. It is equivalent to Gehenna there, a term which Jesus always used to refer to the abode of the lost. He uses it ten times together with other passages associated with them, in all of which he depicts the eternal suffering, sorrow, misery, and dreadful horror experienced by those who are there. Hell is the future prison-house for rebellious souls, and they go there by their own choice, every act of rebellion and blasphemy leading them nearer their doom. Hell is prepared for the devil and his angels. Judas went to "his own place," "a son of perdition." Jesus said of him: "It had been good for him, had he never been born." No restoration idea in that. And as for the doctrine of annihilation instead of retribution we have but to quote Matt. 25:41, 46, where Jesus uses one and the same word twice, once to designate the everlasting reward of the righteous, and again to show the everlasting punishment of the wicked. Yet Russell brushes aside the idea of hell with the vapid sentiment that God is too good to punish. He and all others like him must remember that God is holy and just, as well as good. Holiness is fundamental. God cannot look with favor upon sin, nor in any wise clear the guilty, except by the way of holiness through Jesus Christ. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Those who reject Jesus can not escape the damnation of hell. Russell denies there is a hell, and he drilled the idea into his followers so thoroughly that, several years ago, they had a convention in Washington, D. C., in the midst of the scorching heat of summer and abolished hell by vote. It was the most ridiculous thing which those unfortunate, well-meaning, but deceived people have tried to do. One of Russell's chief lectures is entitled: "To Hell and Back Again." It is a palatable feast for perishing souls, but woe to the man who gives

them a stone for bread. Sinners are always looking for salve with which to anoint their troubled consciences, and thousands have been confirmed and hardened in their evil lives by hearing him. He has allied himself with Robt. G. Ingersoll, and Thomas Paine in tearing down the greatest barrier God, in His mercy, ever put up to keep people from rushing pell-mell into everlasting ruin. God in love has given men every warning. He does not want them to be lost. They are lost, if lost, in spite of all God has done. "Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life."

METHODS OF PROPAGANDA.

1. Russell impresses his followers with the idea that he unquestionably has the complete understanding of Scriptures. No pope ever assumed more imperial sway over his hosts than does this oily propagandist of Dawnism. They believe he is an inspired Elijah to prepare the world for the millennium. He numbers himself among the "holy people" who are waiting for the kingdom, and Russellites need not study the Bible itself, but only "Studies in the Scriptures" to be prepared for the kingdom. They will know more of the Bible by studying his works only than by studying the Bible itself. This was too much for even some of the Russellites. In the statement of the reason for their defection from the Pastor one group said: "When man thus belittles God's Word and makes his own superior to that of God, it seems to be nothing short of blasphemy."

2. His converts are taught to do his bidding. In that way they consecrate themselves. In the "People's Pulpit" he says: "The new beginners were invited to take another step, to consecrate themselves—their wills, minds, bodies, time, influence, money, talents to God, to Christ, to the service of the truth and righteousness." Accordingly these beginners become colporteurs and tract distributors, and thus take their first step into the purgatorial fires of tribulation through which they hope to reach the divine nature. But they go not to the unchurched, to the poor and needy, to jails and asylums, to

the slums and heathen, so much as to established Christians of all denominations, to Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies; they go from house to house, and to conventions, district and general, posing as distributors of good literature. As colporteurs they go by twos, and they canvass every home. If they cannot sell their books they will give them away. Such an eager lot of zealots Russell has ever had at hand, who hope to reach the throne by their sacrifices and good works.

3. By self-sacrificing giving. Russell asks complete surrender of purse as well as mind. In his trial with the "Brooklyn Eagle" the fact was brought out that his followers surrender their earnings to him, and in turn they are allowed to retain ten dollars a month and expenses for themselves. These are called free-will offerings or donations. One year they amounted to \$202,000. This explains how he could advertise his sermons in 1400 newspapers, hire high-class theatres for lectures, and stage a moving picture play, "The Creation." It explains why many who serve him go in shabby clothes, impoverish themselves, and suffer want. It explains cases of unhappiness that have separated families, and brought sorrow to many hearts. But many are getting awake and withholding their resources from his coffers since the failure of his prophecy. He has virtually acknowledged this fact in a recent issue of the "Watch Tower," in which he has ordered retrenchment along all lines on account of a falling off of income.

4. Not the least of the ways in which he stirs up his followers is his reprehensible, contemptible, unwarranted attacks upon other churches. His cheap way of gaining pre-eminence is to blacken others that he may appear whiter. His chief method is misrepresentation. In a circular letter dated June 15th, 1912, he makes the following cantankerous, malicious statement: "Sad I am that it is true that the ministers of all denominations (with some noble exceptions) are the chief foes of real Bible study. Christians of all denominations love and reverence the Bible as the Word of God. Under the light now shining from one page of it to the other, they would

soon discard the creeds of the darker past and become one united church—were it not for the ministers. The preachers having lost faith in the inspiration of the Bible are ‘higher critics.’ They do not wish to show their unbelief, hence avoid Bible discussion. They await the ripening years of unbelief when they can publicly say, We educated ministers have not believed the Bible inspired for many long years. We kept quiet until you would not be shocked by the statement.” Here he slanders and vilifies the great body of Gospel ministers, seeks to undermine their influence, and steal the hearts of the people away from them and win them to himself. His work is that of a charlatan, who resorts to innuendo, mud-slinging, and chicanery, and even falsehood to gain his end. Yet, sly old fox, he is always posing as a humble saint whose solicitous soul is piteously vexed at the way the churches are being deceived. But he has gone the limit of his power, and will stand condemned by his own words as a freak and a failure. Before long he will be forgotten as Dowie now is, and the only reminders of his spectacular career will be the wrecks of his teachings strewn along the way—a lot of disappointed, suspicious, skeptical, disgusted, prejudiced victims of deceit.

Lafayette Hill, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

THE LUTHERAN VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT.

What is it? Is it Biblical and Rational?

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

I.

First, we shall endeavor to discover whether there is a Lutheran consensus on the doctrine of the atonement. It shall not be our purpose to be exhaustive, but merely to cite enough quotations from our Lutheran authorities to indicate clearly what their conceptions were.

Let us begin with Luther himself, and take as our guide Koestlin's great work, "The Theology of Luther," translated by Rev. Charles E. Hay, A.M., and published by the Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia. The discussion of Luther's doctrine of "The Work of Christ" is found in Vol. II, pages 388-424. After discussing Luther's view of the active obedience of Christ, Dr. Koestlin says (page 394) : "The second item, however, has already to do with something which, as the *punitive consequence* of sin, lay upon us, and was now taken upon Himself by the Redeemer. The active obedience thus here already assumes the form of an enduring or suffering. Thus, too, Luther is accustomed to combine directly with the subjection of Christ to the Law also His further subjection to its curse, or to the penalty which it threatens to inflict upon those who violate it. Christ has taken both upon Himself for us—has done the works of the Law, which He was not bound to do, and has willingly endured the punishment and penalty of the Law." Page 395 : "It is not really the active work of Christ itself which has redemptive power for us, but *His taking upon Himself that which we had as sinners to bear.*" "Yet he occasionally, in scattered passages, employs also directly such expressions as : that Christ has been made the '*reus*' (one

accused) of all sins; that upon Him, the innocent, fell 'the guilt or penalty.'" Page 396: "Over the sinner hangs the Law, with its *sentence of condemnation and its curse*. Christ takes this sentence upon Himself, and endures the curse and its visitation, just as though He had Himself broken the Law." Page 398: "Hence, although the Jews wrongfully punished and cursed Him as having personally committed blasphemy, He was, as the bearer of our sin, punished and made a curse by the divine Law itself." "It is *punishment* which God here suffers to come upon Him, for God has laid upon Him the iniquity of us all. (Isa. 53:6). 'We dare not emasculate these words, for God is not jesting in the words of the prophet.' The Lamb of God bears our sins, and bearing is rightly interpreted as being punished. He is punished just because He assumes and bears our sins." Page 399: "As God punishes sinners not only with death, but with the terrors of an alarmed conscience, which feels the eternal wrath of God and seems to itself to have been forever cast away from His presence, so Christ suffered the terrors of a conscience alarmed and tasting the eternal wrath of God. It was necessary for Him to experience for us in His innocent, tender heart eternal death and condemnation, and to endure, in short, everything which man has merited and must eternally suffer."

These are all the quotations needed to show Luther's position. While the quotations are from Koestlin (except a few that are direct from Luther, indicated by single quotation marks), this learned author everywhere indicates by footnotes where the original text is found in the works of the reformer. Our quotations clearly prove that Luther looked upon Christ as the sinner's true Substitute, not only suffering the misery of sin, but also enduring its penalty. According to Luther, in this way only could Christ have truly and organically taken the sinner's place.

Melanchthon was also clear on this doctrine, as is evident from the following quotation (*Loci Communes*, II, 212): "Since therefore men did not afford obedience, it was necessary either that they should perish as a punish-

ment, or that another pay the penalty or ransom; therefore by His wonderful and unerring counsel the Son of God, by interceding for us, paid the ransom and drew upon Himself the wrath which we ought to have borne; wherefore God did not abate His law without a compensation, but preserved His justice in demanding punishment. Christ therefore says, 'I am not come to destroy but to fulfill the law,' namely, by undergoing punishment for the human race and by teaching and restoring the Law in believers."

Next we will cite our Lutheran confessions. In the Augsburg Confession no theory of the atonement is formulated, just as there is no direct formulation of the doctrine of Biblical inspiration; yet, just as the Scriptures are everywhere appealed to as the veritable Word of God, even James and Revelation being cited, so everywhere is the doctrine of a real expiation for sin through Christ taken for granted. In Article III we read that Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, that He might reconcile the Father unto us, and be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but for all actual sins of men." The following clause from the fourth article teaches the same truth: "that their sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, who, by His death, hath made satisfaction for our sins." The twentieth article declares of Christ that He "alone has been set forth the Mediator and Propitiation (1 Tim. 2:5), in order that the Father may be reconciled through Him;" and Art. XXI: "But the Scripture teaches not the invocation of saints, or to ask help of saints, since it sets before us Christ, as the only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest and Intercessor."

In the Apology we have the doctrine of Luther still more clearly set forth. Note the following (page 113, line 58, Jacobs' edition): "Paul teaches this in Gal. 3:13, when he says, 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us,' i. e., the Law condemns all men but Christ, because without sin He has borne the punishment of sin, and been made a victim for us, has removed the right of the Law to accuse and condemn those who believe in Him, because He Himself is

the propitiation for them, for whose sake we are now accounted righteous." Page 262, 19: "One is the *propitiatory* sacrifice, i. e., a word which makes satisfaction for guilt and punishment, i. e., one that reconciles God, or appeases God's wrath, or which merits the remission of sins for others." Page 263: "And Isaiah interprets the Law in order that we may know that the death of Christ is truly a satisfaction for our sins, or expiation, and that the ceremonies of the Law are not." "Isaiah and Paul, therefore, mean that Christ became a victim, i. e., an expiation, that by His merits, and not by our own, God might be reconciled."

The Formula of Concord is breathed through and through with the thought of a piacular sacrifice, but, so far as we can find, the idea that Christ's sacrifice was a penal offering is rather implied than explicitly taught. One quotation will be sufficient (page 580, 57): "But because, as above mentioned, the obedience is not only of one nature, but of the entire person, it is a complete satisfaction and expiation for the human race, whereby the eternal, immutable righteousness of God, revealed in the Law, is satisfied, and is thus our righteousness, which avails before God, and is revealed in the Gospel, and upon which faith relies, which God imputes to faith, as it is written (Rom. 5:19): 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous.'"

A number of quotations will now be given from the Lutheran dogmaticians, those from the older class being taken from Schmid's "Doctrinal Theology of the Lutheran Church," translated by Hay and Jacobs, third revised edition. Our first citation is from Hutter (page 350 of Schmid): "For when about to reconcile the world, and that, too, not without unparalleled feelings of mercy, He saw that satisfaction must first be made to justice. Therefore He turned upon Himself the penalties due our sins, He was made sin for us, He truly bore our griefs, and thus became obedient to God the Father, even to the death of the cross, satisfied divine justice to the exactest point, and thus reconciled the world, not only to God the

Father, but also to Himself.” On the same page and running over to the next, we have Hutter again in a fine passage: “Neither the devil, nor sin, nor death, nor hell, but God Himself was the ruler holding the human race in captivity, as He delivered it to the infernal prison by this sentence, ‘Thou shalt surely die.’ The devil bore only the part of a lictor; sin was like chains; death and hell like a prison. Therefore the price of redemption was to be paid, not to the devil, not to sin, not to death or hell, but to God, who had it in His power once again to declare the human race free, and to redeem it for grace; providing only a satisfaction to the exactest point be rendered to His justice.” This profound Lutheran theologian therefore disposes of the old Origenistic error that the ransom Christ paid was to the devil.

One of the astutest of the old dogmaticians was Gerhard, from whom we quote the following incisive sentences (page 361). “Christ, however, made full satisfaction not only for actual sins, but also for the temporal and eternal punishments due our sins: 1. According to the nature of a perpetual relation, when the guilt is removed, the debt of punishment belonging to the guilt is also removed. But Christ took upon himself our sins, Isa. 53:6; John 1.29; 1 Pet. 2:24. Therefore He also transferred to Himself the penalty due to our sins, and consequently freed us from the debt of the penalty that was to be paid. 2. Scripture emphatically says that the punishment due our sins was imposed on Christ, Isa. 53:5. 3. All punishments, temporal and eternal, corporeal and spiritual, are included under the term *curse*, Gal. 3:13. One punishment of sin is the curse of the Law; but ‘Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.’ Another punishment of sin is the dominion of Satan; but Christ has delivered us from the dominion of Satan, Heb. 2:14.” So says this thorough-going writer respecting the punishments of God’s wrath, death, hell and eternal condemnation. Continuing: “4. God’s justice does not allow the same sin to be punished twice; and He has ‘bruised’ His most beloved Son for our offenses, Isa. 53:4. Therefore He will not punish sin in those who have be-

come partakers of the satisfaction rendered by Christ.”

In a significant citation from Quenstedt we note that he tells to whom the satisfaction was rendered and for what (page 348): “For the entire Holy Trinity, offended at sin, was angry with men, and on account of the immutability of His justice (Rom. 1:18), the holiness of His nature and the truth of its threatenings, could not with impunity forgive sin, and without satisfaction receive men into favor. But this triune God has not the relation of a mere creditor, as the Socinians state, but of a most just judge, requiring, according to the rigor of His infinite justice, an infinite price of satisfaction. For redemption itself, made for the declaration of righteousness (Rom. 3:25), proves the necessity of requiring a penalty, either from the guilty one himself, i. e., man, or from his surety, namely, Christ. If God without a satisfaction could have forgiven man’s offense, without impairing His infinite justice, there would have been no need of such an expense as His only Son.” Quenstedt says further (page 351): “It was the infinite God that was offended by sin, and because sin is an offense, wrong and crime against the infinite God, and, so to speak, Deicide, it has an infinite evil, not formally . . . but objectively, and deserves infinite punishments, and therefore required an infinite price of satisfaction, which Christ alone could have afforded.” Then in a fine argument he goes on to show that a mere human creature, however worthy, could not have made atonement for infinite sin, but that a being who was both human and divine was needed for such a task; and Christ was such a Being, His divine nature giving infinite efficacy to His human suffering.

Hollaz (page 356): “By the passive obedience Christ transferred to Himself the sins of the whole world (2 Cor. 5:31; Gal. 3:13), and, besides this, suffered the punishment due them, by shedding His most precious blood and meeting for all sinners the most ignominious death (Is. 53:4; 1 Pet. 2:24, etc.), in order that, to believers in Christ the Redeemer, sins might not be imputed for eternal punishment.” To show that Christ made vicarious satisfaction, Hollaz continues: “To a vicarious penal

satisfaction, (a) if it be *formally* regarded, there is required: 1. A *surrogation*, by which some one else is substituted in the place of a debtor, and there is a transfer of the crime, or an imputation of the charge made against another. 2. A *payment of penalties*, which the substituted bondsman or surety makes in the place of the debtor; (b) considered with regard to the *end*, the payment of the penalty, for the discharge of the debtor, occurs in such a way that he is declared free from the crime and penalty." The chief objection of the Socinians against vicarious atonement, namely, "The action of one cannot be the action of another; the fulfillment of the Law is an action of Christ; therefore the fulfillment of the Law cannot be our action," Hollaz refutes in this way: "An action is considered either *physically*, as it is the motion of one acting, or *morally*, as it is good or evil. The action of one can be that of another by imputation, not physically, but morally."

These old dogmaticians answered nearly all the objections that have ever been brought forward against the orthodox view of the atonement, even those that the so-called "modern mind" cannot accept. For instance, the Socinians said that satisfaction was in conflict with the *gratuitous* remission of sins, as a creditor cannot be said to remit a debt gratuitously for which satisfaction has been rendered. To this Gerhard nobly replied: "There is no opposition here, but only a subordination, Rom. 3:24: 'Being justified freely by His grace' (gratuitous remission), 'through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus' (satisfaction); Eph. 1:7: 'In whom we have redemption through His blood' (satisfaction), 'the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace' (gratuitous remission). As the grace of God does not destroy the justice of God, so gratuitous remission does not annul the satisfaction and merit of Christ which the Law demands. Nor was God a mere creditor, but also a most just judge and avenger of sins; nor were sins mere debts, but they conflict with the immutable justice of God revealed in the Law. In short, the particle *freely* excludes our worth, our merit, our satisfaction; but in no way the

satisfaction of Christ. The mercy of God remitting sins is gratuitous; but not so absolute as to exclude the merit of Christ."

In vindication of the fact that Christ made a sufficient expiation for the sins of the whole world and all the penalties involved, Quenstedt says: "The form or formal mode of the satisfaction consists in the most exact and sufficient payment of all those things which we owed. . . . Indeed, this very payment of the entire debt of another, freely undertaken by Christ, and imputed to Him in the divine judgment, was sufficient not merely because accepted of God. For this satisfaction God did not, out of mere liberality, accept anything that was not such in itself; neither in demanding a punishment due us and rendered by a surety did He abate anything; but in this satisfaction Christ bore everything that the rigor of His justice demanded, so that He endured even the very punishments of hell, although not in hell nor eternally. . . . Therefore the satisfaction of Christ is most sufficient and complete by itself, or from its own infinite and intrinsic value, which value arises from the facts, (1) that the Person making the satisfaction is the infinite God; (2) that the human nature, from the personal union, has become participant of the divine and infinite majesty, and therefore its passion and death are regarded and esteemed as of such infinite value and price as though they belonged to the divine nature."

Long ago the Photinians raised this objection: "The curse of the Law was eternal death; but now, since Christ did not endure eternal death, He has not undergone or borne for us the curse of the Law." To this Hutter replied: "The reasoning deceives through the sophism of *non causa pro causa*. For it is not true that the merit of Christ is not of infinite value for the reason that Christ met a death that is not eternal; for as the sins of our disobedience are actually finite, yet in guilt are infinite, since they are committed against the infinite justice of God; so the obedience of Christ were indeed finite in act, so far as they were circumscribed by a period of fixed time, namely, the days of humiliation; but they are infinite

with respect to merit, inasmuch as they proceed from an infinite person, namely, the only begotten Son of God Himself." No less profoundly does Hollaz argue (page 360): "Christ endured a punishment equivalent to eternal punishment, inasmuch as he suffered the punishments of hell *intensively* as respects their power, weight and substance, although not *extensively* so far as their duration and the accidents pertaining to the subject's sufferings are concerned; He bore the extremity but not the eternity of tortures."

In opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of a limited atonement these profound authors championed the doctrine of its universality, in spite of the fact that some for whom Christ died do not accept the expiation He made. But we need not go into that matter.

It may be said that these are only the views of the old Lutheran dogmaticians, those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that therefore they are antiquated, and cannot be held by the modern Lutheran mind. To show that this is a mistaken view we will quote from most of our present-day Lutheran theologians, who have had the advantage of what the fathers have thought and also that of the most advanced thought of the centuries since their time. We shall begin with the great Bishop Martensen. Beginning on page 302, he covers several pages with a most vital discussion of the High Priestly functions of Christ. It is all worthy of careful reading, because Martensen always discusses theology as if it dealt with the elemental constitution of God and the universe, and as if nothing in God's scheme were merely mechanical, but all organic, orderly and rational. With Him there are no accidents in God's plan, no missing links, no after-thoughts. On page 308 he treats of the active and passive obedience of Christ, just as the older theologians did, only he says the contrast between the two is only relative. Bearing this qualification in mind, he holds to the old-time classification: "Christ is our righteousness inasmuch as He in active life fulfilled the Law (*obedientia activa*), and by His sufferings and death offered Himself up for our transgressions (*obedientia passiva*)."

Going into the very heart of the piacular work of Christ, Martensen says (section 167, page 312): "The perfect sacrifice to atone for sin consists not only in the perception of sin and sorrow on account of it, but in the voluntary endurance of *its penalty*—of the suffering which is the consequence of it. Now, all the consequences of sin, all human misery, is summed up and consummated in death, which is the *wages of sin*. Christ, being the spotless one, has no sin of His own for which to suffer, yet He suffered what sinners deserve to suffer—He submitted to death, to death which has in it the sting of sin. When we say that the Lord died the death of a malefactor upon the cross, we express the truth that He died that death which is the wages of sin. But the sting in His death is the sin of the world,, which He bore upon His heart as our High Priest, the judgments of God which were laid upon His soul. By thus voluntarily enduring the punishment, voluntarily giving His entire personality up to death, He nailed our sentence to His cross. The penalty being endured, justice is satisfied and a perfect sacrifice is offered for 'the remission of sins.' Thus, as this act of sacrifice is the sacrifice of the new Adam, it is really the act of human nature, of human freedom; but it can be the act of human freedom only because it is the act in history of God's merciful grace, because the suffering Adam is none other than the suffering God—God Himself in the lowest humiliation of humanity—the dying God-man."

The views of Dr. S. S. Schmucker are partly set forth in his lecture on "The Person and Work of Christ," published in the Holman "Lectures on the Augsburg Confession," first series, 1866-86. The testimony of Dr. Schmucker is not so clear as is that of most of the other theologians whose views we have examined. Perhaps this is due to the fact that his lecture was intended more to be a historical review than a presentation of the theory of the atonement; yet it seems strange that the statements of the dogmaticians as we have given them should not be more lucidly and definitely set forth in a historical review. However, there are hints in this article of Dr. Schmucker's own opinions. On page 96 he says: "But

‘that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission of sins,’ is further evident from the essential attributes, the punitive justice and holiness, of God.” Here we would expect our author to bring out the idea of God’s penal justice clearly, but he indulges in remarks of a general character. However, on page 97 he says: “Now the infinite Jehovah, having determined on this plan of salvation, by the suffering death of His own Son upon the cross, we must regard the plan as consonant with His nature, and as satisfactory to the demands of the violated law. We are therefore compelled to regard these sufferings of the God-man as absolutely necessary, unless God would abdicate the throne of the universe, or divest Himself of those essential attributes in consequence of which ‘He is angry with the wicked every day,’ Ps. 7:11, and ‘the thoughts of the wicked are an abomination in His sight,’ Ps. 15:26, and ‘without holiness no man shall see God.’” We confess that this is somewhat equivocal, or at least indeterminate; yet it is difficult to believe that Schmucker did not in reality hold the right view, because afterward he criticises and rejects the governmental theory of Grotius, calling it “a radical error, ignoring the essential holiness, justice and benevolence of God and attributing to him mutability,” etc. He also shows the insufficiency of the moral influence theory of Abelard and the errors of the Tridentine soteriology. Criticising the views of Abelard and Peter Lombard, he says (p. 101): “Bernard of Clairvaux was more evangelical, and inclined to the Anselmic theory.”

In Dr. Schmucker’s “Popular Theology” (fifth edition, 1846) he gives some excellent reasons why the atonement for men’s sins could be effected only by the incarnate Logos (page 156): “The basis of this covenant (the covenant of grace), the ground on which salvation is bestowed on men, is nothing else than the merits of the incarnate Son of God, Jesus the Christ. In order to accomplish this glorious work of benevolence, it was for several reasons necessary that the second person of the Trinity should assume *human* nature. For as God alone it was impossible for Him to suffer, or die, or yield obedi-

ence to the law made for man. It was meet that the nature which sinned should also suffer, and that, as this earth was the scene of man's rebellion against God, it should be the scene of his redemption also, rather than the world of spirits. A union of the divine nature of the Messiah with an angel would also have exhibited less evidence of condescension; and as both would in that event have been spirits, it would have been much more difficult for man to perceive or understand their union into one person. Moreover, an atonement wrought before the eyes of men could be made intelligible to them, by being thus brought within the sphere of their own senses and observation, much more easily than if it had been achieved in the world of spirits and merely been revealed to us in God's Word."

This we regard as a fine piece of reasoning for the incarnation. As to the *modus operandi* of the atonement, Dr. Schmucker says this on page 162: "The work of Christ may be regarded as the vicarious endurance of incalculable suffering and the exhibition of perfect righteousness, by which full atonement was made and salvation purchased for the whole world, to be offered on conditions made possible by divine grace to all who hear the Gospel. This may properly be termed the Lutheran view of the atonement."

This, we must confess, is a very inadequate statement of the Lutheran view of the atonement; and what the author adds in the next paragraph makes one uncertain as to what his views were. This is the only ambiguous discussion of the atonement that we have found in the works of professedly Lutheran theologians. Its wavering uncertainty simply affords another reason why the American Lutheran Church could not be satisfied with a modified and indeterminate Lutheran theology.

No present-day Lutheran theologian is clearer, more definite and positive in his statements of the evangelical doctrine of the atonement than Dr. H. E. Jacobs. In his excellent little work, "Elements of Religion," his discussion of the priestly work of our Lord is found on pages 119 to 125. First, he shows that there are two kinds of

sacrifices set forth in the Sacred Scriptures, the expiatory or propitiatory and the eucharistic. "The former render God propitious; the latter are testimonies of thanksgiving." "There is but one propitiatory sacrifice, Christ Himself, the Lamb of God offered for the sins of the world. Hence there is but one real priest, Christ Himself, the sacrifice and the priest being one and the same, Heb. 4:14; 10:10." Then he shows that the sacrifice of Christ was truly vicarious. "Suffering unto death was the penalty which God had decreed against sin. Suffering and guilt are inseparable. If man was to be freed from guilt, some one must bear his sufferings for him. Christ took his place. He made Himself chargeable with man's guilt and sin. He became, so far as the law is concerned, the guilty one that man is, in order that man might be the holy one that He is, 2 Cor. 5:21. This is the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction, according to which Christ and man are regarded as exchanging places." (Page 120).

Then our author shows (pages 120 and 121) how impressively the truth in the so-called "moral influence" theory is set forth by the true Biblical doctrine, even more vividly and powerfully than that theory itself when it is regarded as the whole truth about the atonement: "It is true that the awful penalty He pays divine justice testifies to the earnestness of the divine holiness against sin, in that, when God's own Son took the sinner's place, the punishment laid upon Him was so heavy." Further on he shows the real doctrine (pages 121, 122): "As eternal death was the punishment decreed against sin, so eternal death was suffered by Christ. Not a less stroke was inflicted than the law demanded. There was no relaxation or commutation of the penalty. Justice was to be satisfied, and justice cannot be satisfied with less than its 'eye for an eye and tooth for tooth.' Within the period within which He suffered His pains were those which all mankind had merited eternally. It was eternal death intensively. Its pains were concentrated within the few years of His humiliation. The human nature which suffered was sustained by the infinite strength and

endowed with the infinite merits of the divine nature; and thus the price was paid for the infinite guilt of the race." Nowhere have we found a better statement of the righteousness wrought for men by the active obedience than is written on pages 122 and 123 of this book. Further on, he presents also the reason why the atoning merit of Christ is universal, and therefore is not limited only to the elect.

Dr. Jacobs published his "Elements of Religion" in 1894. In 1905 his "Summary of the Christian Faith" appeared. We find that his views underwent no change during the interim. Indeed, we heard him say with his own lips only a few days before the writing of these lines that the theory that Christ did not bear our sins penally cannot be maintained from the Scriptures and Lutheran theology. Let us quote a few pertinent passages from "A Summary of the Christian Faith." First on page 168, after citing many relevant Scripture passages, he says: "These passages concur in teaching that penalties due men on account of their sins have been endured by Christ; that, as a result, God is reconciled with those who had been beneath His wrath; that they are delivered from all liability to punishment, and instead thereof, receive the rewards of Christ's perfect obedience to the law." In answer to the question (page 169), "Whom did Christ satisfy?" Dr. Jacobs says: "2 Cor. 5:19, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself,' shows that it was not only the Father, but the entire Trinity that was offended because of sin, and was reconciled; as well as that it was not merely the Son, but the entire Trinity in and through the Son that made the offering for sin." In regard to the relation in which God received satisfaction, the answer is given thus: "Not as a mere private creditor, ready at will to exact or relieve from an obligation, but as a most just judge maintaining the absolute inviolability of His law." This answers completely the contention that, because God is the loving Father of mankind, therefore He can forgive sin without requiring reparation and punishment; for the Scripture in innumerable places represents God as moral Ruler, Sovereign

and Judge, as well as Father. More than that, how often the father of a family in human relations must punish his children in order to maintain family government and thus show all his children that the laws of the home must be obeyed! Nor does this regime of justice and impartiality on the part of the father subtract one iota from his loving disposition, but rather heightens it, because all can see that his paternal affection is not mere sentiment, but love permeated and exalted by the law of righteousness.

Another question is incisively answered by Dr. Jacobs: "Is it not an act of injustice to allow an innocent one to suffer for the guilt of another?" Our author's reply is: "Not when the innocent one, by his own free will, assumes the burden (Heb. 10:7), and retains the power at will to relinquish it. . . . Not when he has the power to bear the penalties to the utmost, and, after exhausting them, to be both free himself and to bring deliverance to others." We regard this as satisfactory an answer to the oft-repeated cavil as we have ever seen. As these results are precisely what are secured through the atoning work of Christ, the last ethical objection to the just suffering for the unjust has been removed.

As to the divine attributes involved in the redemptive scheme, Dr. Jacobs elucidates in this way (page 170): "His justice in vindicating the law, and inexorably demanding punishment even when His Son occupied the place of the sinner. His holiness in tolerating the sinner only upon the condition of the payment of His debt and the removal of his guilt. Above all, His love in providing such a satisfaction for such enemies." For what sins was this satisfaction rendered? To this question we read the reply: "For all sins and for all their guilt and punishment." The various punishments due to sinners, and therefore visited upon Christ as their daysman, are classified as follows: The curse of the law (Gal. 3:13); the dominion of Satan (1 Thess. 1:10); death (Heb. 2:14, 1 Cor. 15:55); eternal condemnation (Rom. 8:1). This is followed by a discussion of the active and passive obedience, in full agreement with the older dogmaticians.

In reference to the various moral theories of the atone-

ment (those of Abelard, Peter Lombard, Horace Bushnell and James Martineau), Dr. Jacobs explains: "They spring from a superficial view of the guilt of sin and all that it implies. The more sin is minimized the less need is felt of any satisfaction. The result at last is that, with the native goodness of human nature exalted, nothing is left for which a satisfaction is deemed necessary, and the entire life of Christ on earth, ending with His heroic death, is made simply an incentive to evoke virtue in men, and especially to enkindle love to God and all that is godlike."

The writer of the article on the atonement in the Lutheran Cyclopedia was Dr. E. J. Wolf, of whose Lutheran orthodoxy there can be no question. While Dr. Wolf's article is written chiefly in the historical vein, it is easy to see which view of the atonement he himself accepted. He criticises the idea of a ransom being paid to Satan (Origen), the moral influence theory (Abelard, Bushnell, etc.), and the mystical view (Ritschl). After a well-digested discussion of the satisfaction theory according to Anselm, Dr. Wolf remarks: "While this theory of satisfaction, with the doctrine that the merits and sufferings of Christ possess objectively an infinite value, passed into all the creeds of Christendom, it received modifications and additions at the reformation. The Lutherans emphasized the idea of punishment. Christ's self-surrender to death was a confession of the world's guilt vicariously assumed, an acknowledgment and experience of the sentence pronounced upon mankind for their sins. In being made an offering for sin, he bore its penalty (Apology, page 112). They also included in the atonement the whole theanthropic manifestation and life, the active obedience of Christ (Heb. 10:9) as well as the passive, referring the former to the perfect obedience He rendered to the law, the latter to the culmination of His obedience when He voluntarily died upon the cross, a sacrificial victim for His enemies."

After defining the moral influence (Abelard) and governmental (Grotius) theories, Dr. Wolf adds: "The essential ideas of these two theories may be included in the

sacrificial theory, which, however, excludes the defects of both. The latter resolves all the divine attributes into benevolence, and the former derogates from the inexorable justice of the eternal throne. Both minimize the turpitude and the effects of sin, and lose sight of the paramount import of the death of Christ, who, knowing no sin, was made sin for us and hung accursed on the tree (1 Cor. 5:21, Gal. 3:13)."

The next author to whom we advert is Dr. R. F. Weidner, whose work on "Soteriology" in his "System of Dogmatics" was completed at Easter, 1914. His discussion is quite extensive (pages 28-112), and is divided into the Scripture doctrine and the Church doctrine. He opens his thesis in this significant way: "In the universal consciousness of mankind lies that great truth which embodies itself in the sacrificial cultus of all the nations—that sin demands punishment and that the forgiveness of sins needs to be preceded by atonement, expiation or propitiation. . . . Propitiation is the result in which one who is angered or alienated is brought into the relation of love. Atonement is the process or the result by which a condition of unity is made to follow one of disharmony. It is etymologically at-one-ment. They who were two in heart are made by it one in heart. But because of its great agency between God and man, which is expiation, atonement is most generally used for expiation."

Commenting on Isa. 53:5, Dr. Weidner says on page 46: "The meaning is that the Messiah was pierced and crushed on account of our transgressions and sins, which He had taken on Himself to expiate in our stead. This being pierced and crushed for the sake of our sins was the punishment that rested on the Servant for the salvation of His people." On page 47 he gives the substance of Delitsch's interpretation of Isa. 53:6 (see his great commentary, pages 320-322): "God could not recognize the atonement as really accomplished till the representative of the guilty, who stood over against Him, taking their guilt upon Himself, should have tasted the punishment that guilt had incurred. The Hebrew word for iniquity is not merely iniquity, but the guilt it entails and

the punishment it produces. The whole multitude of sins, the mass of guilt, the weight of punishment came, by the arrangement of the God of salvation, whose grace is enshrined in holiness, upon the Servant of Jehovah."

This calls our attention to Delitsch's commentary, which we had forgotten to consult; so we take occasion here to make a few direct quotations from him. On page 320 he says: "But whereas Israel thus heaped guilt upon guilt, the Servant of Jehovah was He upon whom Jehovah Himself caused the punishment of their guilt to fall, that He might make atonement for it through His own suffering. Many of the more modern expositors endeavor to set aside the *poena vicaria* here, by giving to *hanoyah* (caused to fall) a meaning which it never has." Note the fine distinctions and correct theology of the following comment, which, though a little long is too vital and discriminating to be omitted or abbreviated (pages 321, 322): "Now it is indeed perfectly true that the Servant of God cannot become the object of punishment, either as a servant of God or an atoning Saviour; for as servant of God He is the beloved of God, and as atoning Saviour He undertakes a work that is pleasing to God and ordained in God's eternal counsels. So that the wrath which pours out upon Him is not meant for Him as the righteous One who voluntarily offers up Himself. But indirectly it relates to Him so far as He has vicariously identified Himself with sinners, who are deserving of wrath. How could He have made expiation for sin, if He had simply subjected Himself to its cosmical effects, and not directly subjected Himself to that wrath which is the invariable divine correlative of sin? And what other reason could there be for God's not rescuing Him from this bitterest cup of death than the ethical impossibility of acknowledging the atonement as really made, without having left the representative of the guilty, who had presented Himself to Him as though guilty Himself, to taste all the punishment which they had deserved? It is true that vicarious expiation and *poena vicaria* are not coincident ideas. The punishment is but one element in the expiation, and it derives a peculiar character from the

fact that an innocent person voluntarily submits to it in his own person. It does not stand in a thoroughly external relation of identity to that deserved by the many who are guilty; but the latter cannot be set aside without the atoning individual enduring an intensive equivalent to it, and that in such a manner that this endurance is no less a self-cancelling of wrath on the part of God than an absorption of wrath on the part of the Mediator; and in this central point of the atoning work, the voluntary forgiving love of God and the voluntary self-sacrificing love of the Mediator meet together, like hands stretched out to grasp each other from the midst of a dark cloud..... It was the sin of all Israel, as the palindromically repeated *kullanu* emphatically declares, which pressed upon Him with such force when His atoning work was about to be decided. But *Yaon* (iniquity) is used to denote not only the transgression itself, but also the guilt incurred thereby and the punishment to which it gives rise. All this great multitude of sins, and mass of guilt, and weight of punishment came upon the Servant of Jehovah according to the appointment of the God of salvation, who is gracious in holiness." These are the reflections of a great exegete and a great theologian.

Coming back to Weidner, we find this remark on page 79: "Thus Abelard first systematically developed the moral influence theory of the atonement, which was essentially the doctrine of the Socinians of the sixteenth century, and is the doctrine of modern Unitarianism, and such Trinitarians as Maurice, Jowett, Bushnell and others." It would be a good plan for all Lutherans (and others, too, for that matter), who have not already done so, to read Dr. Weidner's history of the development of the doctrine of the atonement, and also his criticism of the various erroneous views (pages 91-111). In concluding his discussion, he has this to say of the substitutionary conception of the atonement (page 112): "The suffering and death of Christ were a bearing of our sin, of our guilt and of our penalty (Isa. 53:6; Gal. 3:13). It was also a *voluntary* execution of a plan that antedated creation, and Christ's sacrifice in time showed what had

been in the counsel of God from eternity (Heb. 9:14). This atonement had its ground in the holiness of God, and in the love of God, which itself provided the sacrifice that, through the suffering of Christ, a way is opened and salvation is offered to man. This theory rests upon correct philosophical principles with regard to the nature of will, law, sin, guilt, penalty and righteousness. It most fully meets the requirements of Scripture. All the demands of holiness are met. It explains all the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament, and gives a proper explanation of the sacrificial language of the New Testament. It alone gives proper place to the death of Christ as the central feature of His work. It pacifies the convicted conscience; assures the sinner that he may find instant salvation in Christ; makes possible a new life of holiness, while at the same time it furnishes the highest incentives to such a life. This is the teaching of conservative Protestants, and has its basis in the Anselmic theory, of which it is a development."

In his excellent book, "Outlines of Doctrinal Theology," Dr. A. L. Graebner condenses the whole doctrine of atonement in a single paragraph (page 135) as follows: "Christ, the God-man, was and is our High Priest, and our only Priest, inasmuch as He in the work of redemption mediated between God and man, performing by His active obedience in man's stead that which God demanded of man, and which man did not and could not in his fallen state perform, a complete fulfillment of all the precepts of Law; and suffering in His passive obedience as man's Substitute that which, according to the Law and God's righteous judgment, man must have suffered here and hereafter, torments and ignominy, death and damnation, thus by His vicarious sacrifice rendering full satisfaction to divine justice, making complete atonement and expiation for the sins of all mankind, reconciling the world with God, propitiating God in our behalf, redeeming all men from the bondage, the curse and the penalty of the Law, from sin, death and the power of the devil, and earning, purchasing and procuring for all sinners perfect righteousness, life and bliss." For each of these statements

Dr. Graebner quotes the relevant passages of Scripture. Any person who desires to examine the full complement of Biblical teaching on the subject of the atonement would do well to examine this work. On pages 143, 144 the author shows why Christ alone, the God-man, could make atonement for the sins of the world. We quote a part of this section: "Being free from every taint of sin, He could render perfect obedience to the Law. Though to his human nature divine attributes were communicated, it was by His humiliation rendered possible that He should undergo the penalties imposed upon man for sin. Being free from original sin and having committed no kind of actual sin, He could make vicarious atonement by bearing the punishment of others. Since He who fulfilled the Law and suffered the penalty for sin was the eternal, infinite God, His active and passive obedience was of infinite and everlasting value, sufficient to purchase righteousness and eternal salvation, not for one man only, but for all the world, whose Substitute He was."

Dr. J. B. Remensnyder's book, "The Atonement and Modern Thought," is well worth reading through and through, for it is a veritable thesaurus on the subject. In Chapter IX He asks the question, "Did Christ suffer the punishment of sin?" and then proceeds to answer it in this way: "The Scriptures teach that Christ bore our sins. 'The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.' 'Who His own self bore our sins in His own body on the tree.' Now there are only two ways in which this could be done, namely, by bearing the guilt or the punishment. But one involves the other. Transgression carries with it, as an inseparable factor, penalty. Guilt and punishment grow out of one stem. If then we say that Christ bore our sins in the sense that He took upon Himself their guilt, it is none the less reasonable to affirm that He endured their punishment." This is on page 67. On page 69 the author says: "God in His justice had to punish the sinner. The penalty for the violation of the Law is death. The sinner or his substitute must die. Christ, sinless and guiltless, offered to bear the guilt and punish-

ment of sin, and thereby became the great atoning sacrifice." On the same page he gives a valuable quotation from Luther which we had overlooked: " 'It is *punishment* which God here suffers to come upon His Son. The Lamb of God bears our sins, and bearing is rightly interpreted as being punished. He is punished just because He has assumed our sins, and God, on the other hand, must therefore assume toward Him the attitude of an enemy.' " On the same page and the next Dr. Remensnyder approvingly quotes the following pregnant passage from the great Presbyterian divine, Dr. Charles Hodge: "The satisfaction of Christ was penal. What the Church teaches when it says that Christ satisfied divine justice for the sins of men is that what He suffered was a real adequate compensation for the penalty remitted; He satisfied justice. But He did not suffer either in kind or degree what sinners would have suffered. In value His sufferings infinitely transcend theirs. The death of an eminently good man would outweigh the annihilation of a universe of insects. So the sufferings and death of the Son of God immeasurably transcended in worth and power the penalty which a world of sinners would have endured."

Another vital point that has not yet been dealt with in this thesis is well stated by Dr. Remensnyder in Chapter X, and that is this: "Is God reconciled to us?" Our author says (pages 71-73):

"Now, it is contended by current critics that this reconciliation in no sense affects God, that it is wholly on man's part, and that God does not need to be reconciled; that His attitude toward the sinner ever remains the same. But the Scriptures represent man as being in his fallen state under the curse of God... We thus see that, on one side, the sinner is steeped in guilt, and, on the other, God is wronged, displeased, and threatens judgment. His law has been violated and His love injured. Christ thereupon makes propitiation, the sinner's guilt is replaced by innocence, and the divine displeasure is replaced by graciousness. The reconciliation hence is mutual. It is not, indeed, that God has changed His essen-

tial nature, but He has changed in this, that His love is now able actively to assert itself instead of His justice.

“When a son falls into vice, and his father refuses to see him, if the son then returns and a reconciliation results, we do not properly say the the son is reconciled to his father, but the son has changed morally, has repented, while it is the father who has been reconciled through the repentance. It may be true, as Bishop Westcott says, that such phrases as ‘propitiating God’ and ‘God being reconciled’ are foreign to the language of the New Testament. Nevertheless, these New Testament expressions themselves are sufficiently indicative of their meaning. Propitiation is not offered to the transgressor, but to the judge. To contend that these passages mean that the sinner is to be propitiated, and not God, is the absurdity of exegesis. So also it is the injured and affronted father who is to be reconciled, not the offending prodigal who is graciously to regard his parent again. And the means of this reconciliation is the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ.”

Our author here quotes from another thus: “We believe there is a sense in which God needed to be reconciled; not that His anger had to be appeased or placated, as if He were resentful or vindictive; no, no, but that His justice had been outraged, His righteous laws trampled upon, and therefore satisfaction had to be rendered before mercy could have a free channel in which to flow down to man the sinner.” Then he quotes from Dr. Kuyper: “We know that this is called the *juridical* conception, and that in these effeminate days men desire to escape from the tension of the right; therefore the ethical conception is lauded to the skies. But this opposition to the juridical conception sets God at naught and grieves Him. The ethical idea is: ‘I am sick; how can I become well?’ The juridical idea is: ‘How can God’s violated rights be restored?’ The latter is therefore of primary importance. I must first acknowledge the living God, and that He has righteous claims upon me, which I have violated and which must be satisfied.”

Let us listen to Dr. Remensnyder again directly (page

75) : "Where there is this deep conception of sin, not only as evil in the sinner, but as guilt, as wrong-doing to God, as doing Him an injury which turns Him away from and against the transgressor, there will be the conviction that God must first be reconciled by an atonement before the repentant sinner can be reconciled to Him." And here our author adds a profound reflection from Rothe's "Still Hours" :

"Because God's anger is a holy anger, it requires that atonement shall be made for sin. God, according to His own nature, requires a satisfaction to be made for sin. In the idea of atonement for sin the willingness of God to pardon the sinner must be presupposed as already existing. God's character requires, not that this willingness shall be awakened by the atonement, but that the moral possibility shall be presented for putting it into effect."

There are many other points unfolded in Dr. Remensnyder's valuable book; the weaknesses of the erroneous views are pointed out, and the objections to the orthodox doctrine are vitally answered; but we cannot quote more. The book is issued by the Lutheran Publication Society, and can be read by all who desire to study its instructive pages.

One of the most satisfactory discussions of the atonement is to be found in Dr. Milton Valentine's "Christian Theology," 2 volumes, Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia. We regret that we cannot quote more extensively, for this article, we fear, is being unduly prolonged. On page 120, Vol. II, we read:

"Christ came in our room and stead 'under the law,' the law of human duty, and through His entire life fulfilled it for us, thus by vicarious action providing for us a perfect righteousness, imputable to all who receive Him as their Saviour. The righteousness due from man, but which he, as sinful, could not attain, was provided by Christ. Jesus' perfect holiness was not maintained simply that He might be ready to present Himself as an unblemished sacrifice at last, but as actually working out and exhibiting an unbroken or sinless obedience that should at once honor the law and be an element in the vi-

carious satisfaction opening the way to forgiveness and acceptance of the unrighteous." Our author then proceeds to present convincing arguments for this phase of Christ's work, the active obedience, as included in the ground of justification. (Vol. II, page 120-125). Then he deals with Christ's passive obedience in the same effective way (page 126): "It is the sacrificial element of the atonement, the Just suffering for the unjust and vicariously satisfying for them. Having kept the law, under which He came for the whole vicarious redemptive service, He submitted to *its penalty*—not for Himself, for He had no sin of His own, but for us, thus paying the debt, i. e., what was due to the demerit and evil of sin for all who make Him and His work their own by faith."

In subsequent pages Dr. Valentine logically unfolds the whole doctrine of the atonement, and points out the errors in all the wrong views, among them those of Abelard, Grotius, and Ritschl. In regard to the Ritschlian view, which looks upon God merely as a Father who needs no propitiation, our author stoutly and effectively maintains that God is also the moral Governor of the world, its Lawgiver and Judge, and therefore must have regard for His moral government. It is all very, very convincing—but we must forbear to quote more.

The following translations have been furnished us, at our request, by our colleague in Hamma Divinity School, Prof. J. L. Neve, D.D. First from Luthardt's "Die Christliche Glaubenslehre" (page 395): "On the basis of Christ's passive obedience, in which He has borne our (future) penalty, in order that we may not have to suffer it, God regards us as such that are freed from guilt and punishment." On the next page: "He was the representative of sinful humanity, which stood under the consequences of its sin." The general discussion is found on pages 397-500.

Rohnert's "Dogmatics of the Lutheran Church" (translated): "According to His active obedience, Christ, although the Lord of the Law, has, out of His free will, put Himself under the Law, in order to fulfill it in our stead, and perfectly to satisfy its demands (Gal. 4:4-5; John

5:20; Rom. 5:18, 19; Matt. 5:17). According to His passive obedience, He has taken upon Himself the curse of the law, and has suffered the penalty of the law, which we as transgressors should have suffered."

Dr. Alexander von Oettingen, "System der Christlichen Heilswahrheit," Vol. II, page 213: "Man's sin has to be appreciated in a twofold sense: The will of the Holy One made demands upon man and he did not obey. In this sense there is a *debitum*, that is, an unpaid debt. Again, the transgression of the divine will puts man under divine punishment (*unter die goettliche strafe*), under the judgment of His wrath, that is, there is guilt (*culpa*), which demands atonement. Correspondingly we have to distinguish (not actually, yet in our mind) between two things in Christ's vicarious atonement. For man, that is, for his benefit, and in his place, Christ, through an act of love (*obedientia activa*), has paid that debt which man owed on the basis of the divine law. But Christ has also experienced on Himself the 'curse of the law,' that is, the penalty of sin; He felt it in the severest struggle within His soul. In a certain sense we can say: He suffered the torture of hell in the painful consciousness that God had forsaken His Son."

After the most searching investigation, von Oettingen sums up the matter in this way (page 220): "As a fulfillment and perfecting of the Old Testament prototype and on the basis of the divine scheme of redemption, the high priestly atonement of Christ is the culmination of His office as Mediator, in so far as He, as the Son of God and man, by voluntarily giving Himself unto death, has borne man's sin and its consequences (divine wrath and penalty) to redeem us from sin, death and the devil, and to effect our reconciliation with God."

These are all the quotations that we will make. Many more might be given. Our investigations prove, we believe, that there is a consensus of view regarding the doctrine of the atonement among truly confessional Lutherans. Our numerous citations show a wonderful unanimity both of thought and mode of expression. The evidence indicates that the Lutheran doctrine is, first, that Christ

wrought out a perfect righteousness for us by His active keeping of the law, His fulfilling of it both in the letter and the spirit; and this perfect obedience is the righteousness which is imputed to us when we accept it by faith; second, by His sufferings and death, that is, His passive obedience, He endured the punitive consequences of our transgressions in our stead, and thus upheld and satisfied the law of eternal justice which had been violated by man's sins; third, the whole gracious plan of atonement had its origin in the paternal love of God, and was carried out in time through the winsome power of His love. Christ did not make atonement for sin to win for us God's love, for it was divine love that sent the only begotten Son into the world and that sustained Him in His atoning work; but the atonement was meant to uphold God's moral universe founded in absolute righteousness, and thus prevent an antinomy between divine love and justice.

II.

That this is the Biblical doctrine seems clear to our way of thinking. Only a few outstanding passages of Scripture need be cited. There is that simple messianic prophecy, Isa. 53:5: "He was wounded for our transgressions," etc. The word "for" certainly connotes substitution, one person suffering in the stead of another. The word "wounded" collated with "transgressions" can mean only punishment. Could a wounding for sin for any other purpose than as a punishment be thought of? Delitsch translates the third sentence of this verse thus: "The punishment was laid upon Him for our peace." Here is clearly taught the doctrine of a vicarious enduring of sin's penalty. Then note: "Through His stripes we were healed." What was the purpose of beating any one with stripes? Punishment, nothing but punishment. The 6th verse (Delitsch's translation): "And Jehovah caused the iniquity of us all to fall upon him." In what way only could our iniquity fall on the Suffering Servant? Only in the way of punitive visitation. Try to think of

it in any other way, and your conception vanishes into indeterminateness.

Take just a few leading New Testament passages. Gal. 3:13: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." What can "the curse of the law" mean but the penal consequence of violation of the law? If it has any other meaning, it must be very obscure. If Christ has "redeemed" us from the law's penalty, it must mean that He has paid the proper price for our redemption, and that price is designated in the text in the simplest words possible: "having become a curse for us"—that is, having taken the punishment due us upon Himself.

Look at another *sedes doctrinae*—Rom. 5:6-8: "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly... But God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." These verses show that God's love is the source (*der Ursprung, die Quelle*) of redemption. Now the Scriptures teach that death is not merely the natural consequence of sin, but also its punishment. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Then if Christ died *for* us, He must have taken our penalty upon Himself.

Compare 1 Pet. 2:26: "Who His own self bore our sins in His body upon the tree." If sin is the terrible thing it is represented to be in the Bible, it deserves punishment. That being so, how could Christ bear our sins without incurring their penalty? Is it not idle to speak of bearing sins without also bearing all that they connote? Another significant passage is 1 Pet. 3:18: "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God." For all who accept the Canonical Scriptures as the veritable Word of God, as the whole Lutheran Church does confessionally, this passage ought to settle the difficulty so often raised that the innocent cannot suffer for the guilty and make atonement for others' sins, for here the statement is clearly made that Christ, the righteous One, did suffer for the unrighteous. The verse also teaches piacular

or substitutional suffering—"for." Now what is the suffering always meted out to unrighteousness? It is only suffering as a natural consequence? No. Is it always a punitive infliction. Therefore if Christ suffered *for* the unrighteous, He must have taken upon Himself the retribution that was due them. To prove that the suffering resulting from sin is penal we cite a few passages: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment" (Matt. 24:46). "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mark 16:16). "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth. (Matt. 24:50, 51). "And cast ye out the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 25:30). "For the judgment came of one unto condemnation; but the free gift came of many trespasses unto justification" (Rom. 5:16). "Rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of Lord Jesus; who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might" (2 Thess. 1:8, 9). "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment" (2 Pet. 2:9). "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23). Hundreds of proof-texts of similar import might be cited, all of them proving that the effects of sin are reprobative, a punishment due, not merely an unhappy consequence. This is in accord with the verdict of conscience, which always feels intuitively that moral obliquity ought to be punished. Now if sin brings inevitable penalty, and if Christ really suffered in our stead, then He must have borne the retribution that was our just desert.

III.

Can the Lutheran and Biblical view of the atonement be vindicated at the bar of reason? Even if the clear Biblical doctrine cannot be so justified in every particu-

lar, the Lutheran ought to accept it, because with him human reason is not the final abiter, not the "formal principle," but the Bible is. However, we believe that the Bible doctrine can be shown to be in harmony with true and logical modes of thought, and to be much more rational than any theory of human speculation. Remember this does not mean that human reason could have ever discovered it. No; it is a *pure* doctrine, known only through the divine revelation of the Scriptures. But, having been revealed, it can be shown to be in accord with rational processes. However, here we must be brief; must touch on only a few points.

At once we must make protest against the modern vogue of calling the so-called "moral influence" and "mystical" theories *ethical* as over against the satisfaction view as if the latter were *unethical*. The fact is, the moral influence theory is not truly ethical; it would better be called the *spectacular* or *emotional* theory. Let us see why. This theory holds that Christ's sufferings did not make a real ethical adjustment in the moral government of the universe, but was only an expedient which God devised to exhibit His love for sinners. Such suffering was not really necessary in the nature of a moral economy; it was simply God's way of showing how much He loves the sinner. It was, so to speak, "gotten up" for that purpose. Then we say in reply, it was *spectacular*; it was done for the sake of an exhibition, simply to make an impression on the sinner's feelings. Are we not correct in saying, therefore, that this theory is not truly a moral adjustment, but merely an emotional appeal through a spectacle gotten up for the very and sole purpose of exciting emotion? Just think soberly for a moment. If there was no moral need for the Son of God to come to earth and suffer, how could the atonement be called an *ethical* transaction? Moreover, a spectacular exhibition of love is not winsome; it fails in its appeal; it is rather repellant. Suppose a husband should devise some mechanical scheme by which to display his love for his wife, do you think she would be greatly impressed by it? But if he would suffer some real affliction for her to save her from sorrow, then, if she had a true wifely

heart in her, she would be deeply touched and won by it. So with the sacrifice of Christ; if He died to make a real expiation for sin, such as men could not make without suffering eternal retribution, then the display of love was indeed winsome and appealing. And divine love is *real* love, in that it *really* gave men a Saviour to take their place. So we say that the satisfaction theory is the only really and profoundly ethical view.

The mystical theory—that of Ritschl—also overlooks the chief ethical element in the atonement. It holds that man and God are simply united in the incarnation of the Son of God. In Christ the human and the divine are mystically united, and if we are mystically united with the incarnate God, that is all that is needed for our complete redemption and restoration. See how lame this view is from the ethical viewpoint. It ignores the guilt of sin, the heinousness of sin, the penalty due to sin as a violation of God's holy law; therefore the need of expiation for sin in order that justice may be satisfied and God's moral government upheld in its integrity. It exalts God's mercy over against His justice; it holds that God's mercy could simply wave aside His justice, and forgive the sinner purely and simply. Is that ethical? Is it ethical to pit one infinite divine attribute against another, and thus create an ethical antinomy in God Himself? Nay, nay; we must go deeper than that; we must have a doctrine that will preserve in uttermost ethical and spiritual harmony all God's attributes, and at the same time uphold God's moral law in the universe. This is done by the satisfaction theory and by none other. Just so the Bible teaches (Rom. 3:23-26): "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in His blood, to show His righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season: that He might be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." There we have a real atonement set forth—one that

makes the ethical adjustment needed in a moral economy.

The Ritschlian view also lays all the stress on the doctrine of God as Father, and sets it over against the juridical character of God. This (we say it kindly) is rationalistic; it does not accept all that the Bible teaches respecting God, but picks and chooses, rejecting those characterizations that do not suit its preconceptions and accepting only those that do. However, we do not so regard the Bible; we believe in its plenary inspiration. And surely the Bible represents God as a many-sided being, represents Him as Creator, Governor, King, Judge, as well as loving Father. Even the New Testament gives these varied representations. How often it depicts God and Christ in the character of Judge! So a theory of atonement that is to be Biblical must adjust itself to all these varied features of God's character.

But suppose, merely for the sake of argument, we take into account for the moment only the Fatherhood of God. Is the father in a family only loving and merciful? Does he always merely forgive, and never mete out justice? Is he not also the governor and the judge in the home as well as the tender Father? Is there not a very clear and vital and necessary sense in which he is often juridical? Surely! If not, what about the family government? Such love as this mystical theory would attribute to the idea of fatherhood is mere sentimentality. Many a human father—that is, one of the right kind—exact punishment for wrongs done to the family regulations, even when at the same time in his heart he forgives—a finite adumbration of the holy and juridical Fatherhood of the infinite God. This mystical theory lacks ethical quality; it should not be classified as an ethical theory; it should be called the sentimental theory.

It is said that the *evil* of sin is not in its punishment. In response we would say that we doubt whether any one has ever held that it is. The evil of sin is in its own intrinsic character; its evil consists in the fact that it is disobedience to the good and holy will and commandment of God; that it is the violent antithesis of the good; that it is the corruption of the pure; moral chaos opposed to

divine and sacred order; envy and hatred of the holy. It is because it is evil *per se* that it merits punishment, and for that reason alone. It is punished because it is evil; it is not evil because it is punished. Pray let us avoid "getting the cart before the horse" in our theologizing and philosophizing. The old-time prophet was profounder than some of the "modern" revisionists. He said: "Know therefore and see that it is an evil thing and a bitter that thou hast forsaken Jehovah thy God, and that my fear is not in thee, saith the Lord, Jehovah of hosts" (Jer. 2:19).

Now, we should like to ask the would-be ethical theorist how sin can be punished except through suffering? Could a criminal against the civil law be punished in any other way than by suffering of some kind? Do you know of any other way by which the sinner against God's law could be punished? No; the only mode of imposing punishment known to the whole human family is by suffering. Not all suffering is penal, but all penalty must mean suffering. It need not always be physical suffering; it may also be psychical; but it is suffering nevertheless. So we say, if Christ was our substitute at all, He could only have stood in our stead for that which was to be visited upon us by God's unalterable justice, namely, the penal suffering for our iniquities.

Sometimes the changes are rung on the statement that punishment does not *destroy* sin; then the conclusion is sought to be drawn from this premise that, if Christ endured the penal consequences of man's sin, it was a useless work, because, after all, it does not annihilate sin. We have done some specializing in ethics, and so we desire to say that sin is not an entity, not a substance, as matter and mind are. It is a quality. In theology we say it is not substantial, but "accidental," though we are not sure the word "accidental" is the best word that might be chosen. Sin is not a foreign *substance* added to the original human nature that God created, as Flacius held, but a derangement, an impairment of its functioning powers, just as when a fine piece of mechanism, like a watch, gets out of repair, not by the insertion of a foreign

element, but by a derangement of some of its parts. So sin impaired the human personality, causing it to function abnormally instead of normally. To use another figure, as long as man made God his center of life, his whole being revolved in a perfect circle and with perfect smoothness and rhythm; but when he chose his own gratification and the world as his chief good, he became uncentered, and so began to whirl around in a jarring, clashing, ruinous eccentric. Therefore, since sin is not something substantial, but qualitative and functional, we do not see why any one should speak about its destruction in the sense of annihilation. No substance, material or spiritual, is ever destroyed, but its quality and its method of functioning are often changed.

Again, we do not know that any event or fact can ever be utterly wiped out or cancelled. It can never *per se* be regarded either by God or man as if it had never been. The *fact* that man has sinned will never be removed. According to Revelation, the saints in heaven are ever praising the Lamb who has washed them and made them white in His blood. So sin cannot be destroyed in this sense either. In the very act of praising Christ for redemption, the saints made perfect must recall their sins.

Then what can be done with sin? Its guilt can be atoned for, satisfaction can be made to justice for it; then it can be forgiven; then by God's Spirit the deranged moral and spiritual mechanism can be repaired, and its normal functioning can be restored. In the organic world all corruption and disease are the result of wrong functioning, not of any change of the *substance* of the primary elements. Take even the disease *baccilli*—the substance (the atoms and molecules) of which they are composed is just the same as the substance of healthy corpuscles, nerves and tissues; it has simply gotten deranged in its functioning. The purpose of therapeutics is not to destroy substance, but to change the abnormal functioning to the normal. The same law holds in the higher realm of Christian ethics. In the ethical realm, however, because sin involves volition, and therefore

means guilt, reparation must be made to the law that has been consciously violated.

A few words in positive vindication of the satisfaction view of the atonement. First, its source and origin are the love of the triune God (John 3:16, Rom. 5:8, 1 John 4:19); second, its primary purpose was the salvation of man; its primary purpose was *not* the expiation of divine justice; third, its plan and method were determined in accordance with an eternally moral economy. While God's love desired to save man, the sinner, God could not and would not save him by an unethical procedure. Suppose God had simply, by the use of His omnipotence, waved aside His justice, so that mercy could be shown to sinners, would that have been ethical? Why, no civil government could long endure if it were built and conducted on such loose, unethical principles. No; if man is to be saved from the dire consequences of his sin, he must be saved ethically or he would not be saved at all; therefore an ethical adjustment must be made. So God's love, wisdom, grace and justice, all working together in beautiful harmony, found the way, and it was the right way, and the only right way. God determined to make reparation to divine justice Himself; and He could do so because He is triune in His constitution, so that while one person of the Godhead took upon Him man's nature, and so took man's place and suffered man's penalty, the other persons retained all the infinite attributes of the Divine Being intact, undimmed, undiminished. And how could God the Son make expiation for humanity's sins? By taking humanity seminally into His Godhead, enduing it with infinite value, moral and spiritual excellence, and then taking upon Himself the penalty of humanity's sins. No finite being, however glorious, could have done this; so that all finite illustrations fail here; but God the Son could achieve the supernatural result, because He was Himself the Infinite One.

But how, how, how? We do not know all mysteries, and we ought not to be so presumptuous as to suppose that we can understand the full mystery of the atonement any more than any other divine and sacred mystery. If

we think and speculate about these mysteries, we should tread very reverently. But can we not apprehend this much as truth? The eternal Logos is the person of the Trinity through whom God made man and the world, through whom He revealed His love and will, through whom He gave the just and holy commandment to man, through whom He announced the moral law, through whom God communed with man in all times. Now may it not be that He, the Logos by these very tokens, is so organically related to the creation and to man (since man was made in His image), that He is, by His very constitution, able to identify Himself with man and creation, to assume man's nature into His Godhood, to become incarnate, and thus to bear man's iniquities, guilt and punishment—to become indeed and in truth his daysman, his substitute? If God made man through the Son, would He not have framed man in such a way that the Son might become like man, and take on his nature, if need should come? And if the Son could become anthropomorphic, He surely could pass through the whole gamut of anthropomorphic experience, could "be touched with a feeling of our infirmities," could be "tempted in all points like as we are," and surely could take our place under the law. Can we not see that the Son, in whose likeness man was made, has a close affinity to man, and so could completely identify Himself with humanity, and thus rightfully bear all humanity's burdens?

But the great *crux* with the theorists has been, How could the just suffer for the unjust? We reply that, if reparation is to be made at all for sin, it could not be made by a sinful being. A sinful being could not atone for anyone's sins but his own. More than that, in the economy of the world there is much vicarious suffering, and somehow, mysterious as it is, men regard it as effective. A mother's vicarious suffering for her children is never found fault with, but is really applauded the world over; and its beneficiaries accept it with profound gratitude. If this is true in a finite way among men, why should it be thought to be incredible that the Son of God should be able to carry out this same principle in a

complete, perfect and infinite way for the eternal well-being of the human family? At all events, it would be strange that the God who made the universe and man, and who has been from eternity, would be so limited that He could not take man's sins upon Himself and make expiation for them.

Can the just atone for the offenses of the unjust? Not in the human world, because man's power is limited, and all men are sinners. So we can find no parallel in human experience and procedure. But let us look at the whole plan of redemption as it is revealed in the Bible, God's Book. Man sins. God in His love desires and determines to save him. So God sends His divine Son into the world, who takes upon Him human nature. He lives a holy, faultless life, thereby setting man an inspiring example, and also keeps for man the holy law that man could not keep. Then He suffers passively, bears the penalty of man's transgressions, cries out upon the cross, "It is finished," dies, and is buried. Now, if that were all! It would be all if the Redeemer were merely a man. But here is where the divine-human Redeemer transcends all the powers of finite man. Having died for man's sins, He becomes alive again by His own divine power, descends into hell and conquers for us the demoniacal personalities who seek man's ruin; then ascends to the right hand of God, and is glorified with all the fullness of God. But that is not all by far. If a good man were to die for the sins of a sinner, the latter would still be in his sins. Not so in the case of the divine scheme of redemption. The Holy Spirit, sent to men by the exalted Redeemer, applies the objective redemption; takes the things of Christ and brings them to men; shows them the surpassing love of Christ upon the cross, enduring their penalty in their stead. If anything will give them a view of the enormity of sin, this vision will. If God could not spare His Son and yet save men, then sin must be an awful, wrecking, corrupting, heinous thing. Who would not want to be saved from such a blighting, cursed defilement? Hence repentance is begotten. But if Christ died for sin, and endured its penalty for me, then if I ac-

cept the Substitution, I will not need to suffer that penalty. Hence faith is begotten, which lays hold upon the atonement wrought. But all this means that the Holy Spirit has begotten a new life in me, leading me to renounce and forsake the sinful life, and devote myself to the holy life and service of God. Where now is there an unethical element inherent in this plan? The Redeemer, after dying for man's sins, and expiating them, returns to His primeval glory, and lifts man from the life of groveling sin into holy fellowship with Himself. That is why all human parallels fail, and why the redemption wrought by the God-man is unique. If it could be paralleled, there would be many redeemers or partial redeemers. As it is, there is but one Mediator between God and man, Jesus the Christ. All the glory belongs to Him. There is no room for human glorying.

Yet the felicity belongs to both our Redeemer and ourselves, who are joined in eternal fellowship, because He who was dead, is alive forevermore, and is able to save us from sin and transfigure our lives. Taken in connection with the whole organic plan of redemption and its beneficent effects for both the redeemed and the Redeemer, we see that the atonement is a vital and necessary link in the chain.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The venerable Dr. Francis L. Patton delivered the charge to Dr. Stevenson at his inauguration as President of Princeton Seminary. *The Princeton Theological Review* (Jan.) contains the address from which we take the following pertinent remarks.

"The Theological Seminary is a training camp for soldiers of the cross. It is also a fortress. I may have occasion to make use of both these metaphors in the course of my remarks, but I have more immediately before my mind the idea that the Seminary is a place for the training of men for the work of the ministry."

"There is a tendency just now to put special emphasis upon the practical side of theological instruction, partly because this phase of the minister's training was relatively neglected in former days and partly also, I have no doubt, because the complicated and multifarious duties of minister of a modern city church are in such decided contrast with the duties devolving upon ministers of the older generation. That this demand for more practical training should be met there can be no question, but in meeting it great care should be taken not to lessen the requirements for thorough study of the great departments of theology. Students naturally desire to receive special instruction in regard to the practical work of the pastorate. This to them is their nearest objective. They accordingly wish to know how to organize the various societies that now form part of a well-equipped congregation; how to manage the Sunday School; how to administer the ordinances; how to solemnize marriage and how to bury the dead. Ministers, too, who have had to learn these things by experience after entering the work of the ministry, sometimes come back to us and ask why they were not taught all these things in the Seminary.

Now of course there is room in a theological curriculum for a great deal of sound advice, good counsel and plain, practical direction which students should have, and which I think they may have without encroaching upon the time which should be devoted to the more laborious work of scholarly acquisition. In fact, the less formal such instruction is, the more likely is it to be of practical value, but it must be evident that it is only in an imperfect way that this can prepare a young minister for meeting the practical exigencies of his calling. It would be impossible for a professor to anticipate the difficulties which a student will meet in the practical work of the ministry. No amount of instruction can supersede the exercise of tact individual judgment. Experience is the best and, in many cases, the only possible teacher."

"I am not so foolish as to suppose that a curriculum is something fixed for all time and that no change can be made in it without detriment to the great interests of theological training. I cannot, therefore, confess to a deep interest in the distribution of hours in the several departments of a theological curriculum. Whether one department gets six hours a week and another five or four is a matter of detail that can best be left with the Faculty where it properly belongs. But I am deeply interested in maintaining without any loss of efficiency the great and masterful branches of theological encyclopaedia, no matter how urgent the demand may be for the entrance of new subjects of study; and in spite of the fact that ministers commonly use their Greek and Hebrew less than they ought to use them, I should deprecate any move that would make the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues an optional thing with any student who wishes to receive the diploma of the Seminary."

"I recognize the importance of some of the new studies for which the plea is made that they should be made part of a theological curriculum. Great questions in social ethics, for example, are demanding the attention of our ministers and these questions should be dealt with in the theological seminary. Sociology is knocking hard for admission at our doors and under the right conditions I

think it should be admitted, but a sociology of experimentation, of artificial methods of reform and of mere statistical information does not fulfill these conditions. The pathological conditions of society, as they reveal themselves in poverty, disease and crime, deserve the serious consideration of the Church and may well fall within the scope of the minister's work. But it is not so much the phenomenology of disease that deserves our attention as its etiology and its therapeutics. As to the first question we shall find that the answer is given in the old-fashioned doctrine of sin, and whether the answer to the second is to be found in a war against circumstances or a change of heart will depend upon the conception men have of the meaning of Christianity. I still adhere to the Gospel as the best and only cure for all social ills."

The Harvard Theological Review (Jan.) in an article on "Confucianism" by Gilbert Reid of Shanghai, China, five reasons are given why Confucianism should be held in esteem. (1) Its emphasis on the duties of right living. (2) Its social, political and educational principles. (3) Its recognition of the root or origin of things. (4) The high moral character of its original teachers. (5) Its universal adaptation.

"These five reasons should convince everyone that for a Christian to appreciate Confucianism is not senseless or base, but reasonable and sound. The position is both liberal and orthodox. The one great criticism passed to-day on Confucianism is that it has no vitality, no dynamic power, and, being a human teaching, can have none. It is true that it seems to be decadent, that its good points are being discarded, and that it is fast becoming mere ceremonialism, a worship of Confucius, a cult, and not a life or even a system of religion or ethic. To my mind this is to be regretted. It is equally clear that the criticism contains a fallacy. If Confucianism as a religion has lost its power, it should not be forgotten that many branches of the Christian Church in the past, and also to-day, have been decadent, retaining the form but losing the life of a spiritual religion. The only way for Confu-

cianism or Christianity or any other religion to have life-giving power is to resume connection with the one true and living God, rely more on His spiritual presence than on systems and forms, rites and creeds, and believe with a new assurance of faith the God is All and in all, and that man, while His offspring, can do no good apart from Him. This truth, as well as the criticism itself, applies equally to the Christian and the Confucianist."

In *The Expositor* (Jan.) Professor H. R. Mackintosh of Edinburgh, in exposing the fallacy of the doctrine of "The Vicarious Penitence of Christ," as a substitute for our Lord's atonement says:

"A final objection to making vicarious penitence the central thing in our Lord's atonement may be put thus. At bottom the atonement is something provided, something done by God; it is an expression of His nature. Always in religion God is the doer and we are the receivers only. This means, I cannot but think, that whatever constitutes the central core of atonement must be predicable of God; you must be able to carry it back to God Himself and say, What Christ felt, did, suffered, was in the truest sense felt, done, suffered by God. For the atonement really is the cost to God of forgiveness. But we cannot predicate penitence of God. We cannot represent Him as experiencing contrition for human sin. On the other hand, if what I see in the dying Saviour is holy judgment of sin and infinite self-abnegating love—that I can carry back to God; I can take the central experience of Christ and assert it of God Himself. The cross is then seen as a Divine act."

The American Journal of Theology (Jan.) has an article by the Rev. Dr. Carl S. Patton of Columbus, Ohio, in which miracles are utterly discredited and which concludes as follows:

"I want to ask now, in closing, two practical questions.

First, if one is compelled to give up his belief in miracles, is this any loss to him religiously? Does it leave him with less evidence of the power and presence of God?

In particular, does it leave him without revelation? Quite the reverse—if only one has the proper idea of God. Given a God who lives outside the world, and has no necessary connection with nature or man, and miracles are a necessity. It is by miracle that such a God reveals Himself. It is only by a miracle that such a God can break into this world to which he is naturally a stranger. But given a God who dwells in nature and in man, and he is revealed in the orderly processes of human life. But if he is revealed in these orderly and ordinary processes, then an interruption of these can be no addition to his revelation. It can be only a confusion and an interruption of it. One reason, therefore, why one discards the old belief in miracles is that, since he has come to a better idea of God, miracles stand in his way. It is not merely a difficulty to believe them, but it would be a calamity to him if he had to. For one cannot really believe that God is revealed in nature and in the orderly processes of human life and at the same time believe that he is revealed in miracles.

Secondly, if any preacher has come to this position in regard to miracles, what shall he do with it in the pulpit? In one way, little or nothing; in another way, a great deal. I do not conceive it to be necessary that ordinary people should be plunged into doubts which they do not have, except as this may sometimes be unavoidable in the attempt to teach religious conceptions that shall have an enduring quality superior to that of purely popular religious ideas. I should think it would be very foolish, therefore, for a man to go specifically into this matter of miracles before his congregation. His people would not understand him, and they would derive no benefit from his exposition."

It would seem from the above that liberal theology not only rejects the mighty works of Christ, but would deal somewhat unethically with "ordinary people" when trying to evade miracles in pulpit discourses.

"Ought Christians to be Pacifists?" asks Dr. H. W. Magoon in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Jan.) He concludes that the Christian must fight to maintain righteousness.

"If the peace is broken, men suffer in their earthly possessions. The bare prospect of a thing of that sort usually stirs them to action. They are loath to run any risk of financial loss. If war shakes them out of that bit of selfishness, it is not wholly bad. But if they work for peace from motives of that kind, let them not hug themselves with a smug complacency, as humble followers of the Galilean. They are nothing of the sort. They are parasites on his bounty and little else. He stands for righteousness, and he stands for it at any cost.

"No. I am not a bloodthirsty swashbuckler. I am the mildest kind of a mild-mannered man; but I see things as they are. This present war was bound to come. It could not be avoided. And it must be fought to a finish. If it is not, then we shall make no progress in the paths of peace. And we must be ready to do our part—if necessary. God forbid that it should be necessary; but God forbid still more that we should dodge or shirk our duty. Let us by all means be followers of the Galilean. No nobler calling can await us, and we shall gain, not lose in manliness.

"It is no time for such persons to lose heart. Nor is it time for them to abandon high ideals. Let them work for peace, if they will; but let them remember that righteousness must come first. Peace without that, even if it is established among the nations now at war, will be a great disaster. It will be a dream and a delusion. Nothing short of international righteousness will answer, and we must be prepared to back up that position to the limit. If it means another baptism of blood for us, that can make no difference. If we are followers of the Galilean, we must be ready to pay even that price for righteousness in the world at large. On no other basis are we safe. And on no other is he honored."

In the same *Quarterly*, E. S. Buchanan of Oxford, Eng., pleads for a return of "The Lost Christ" whom modern criticism has uncrowned. He says:

"We desire the healing touch of Christ to-day as never before. We know no other Saviour and we desire no

other. The Christ of philosophy will not save us. The fallible and fanatical Jesus of the University professors will not save us. The sacramental Christ of the Church will not save us. The human-born Jesus of Doctor Harnack and Doctor Sanday will not save us. Our salvation has been laid on one that is mighty, on one that is the eternal God, on One who loves us and gave Himself for us and is now seated at the right hand of God. Such a one by sharing our humanity calls forth our love; and by redeeming our humanity calls forth our adoration. Without Him our religion becomes either a system of thought, or a round of ceremonies, or a philanthropic aspiration. With Him as the object and inspirer of our worship, our life has a center of immutable Truth and unchangeable Love."

"Humanity needs humanity to love and to be loved by, that so it may approach God. Our merely human guides fail us in the great crisis of life; but Christ, who to our humanity joins omnipotency, is thereby able to save us to the uttermost. For our sake He took our weakness for a season; but now is risen and death hath no more dominion over Him. The Christ St. Paul loved and was loved by is the true Christ; and we need more than we need anything else to recover the vision of His glory. In Him, and only in Him, does our life find any satisfying explanation; in Him, and only in Him, are we saved from sinning and a consequent misery; in Him, and only in Him, have we love and the forgiveness of sin; in Him, and only in Him, have we true fellowship and brotherhood; for in him there is neither Jew nor Gentile, German or Englishman, man or woman, employe or employer. In Christ we are all children of God, and our abiding Fatherland is not on earth, but in Heaven."

"Though we have lost Christ, yet he had not lost any one of us. Having loved once, He loves forever. The Sun of Righteousness may be unseen by those who inhabit dens and caves of the earth, but He has not fallen from the heavens. The vision is not irrecoverable, and our need demands the vision to-day as never before in the world's history. Christ was lost to those who walked

with Him on the way to Emmaus; but in the inn—at the twilight hour—He revealed Himself to their unspeakable joy. Their national hopes were shattered, their dreams of individual triumph under an earthly potentate were at an end. Instead of these, they received from Him the vision of an eternal city of men of all nations and kindreds and tongues to be united under one King, whose brow was once crowned with thorns, but was now forever crowned with glory.”

“Human systems and modes of thought wax old and vanish away, and we lose even the memory of them. But of Christ’s kingship there is to be no end. He may be lost to some of us—to our own unhappiness; but He remains ever to be found by those who seek Him—*Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever.*”

“The Person and the Order” is the theme of an article by Dr. Robt. E. Speer in the *Biblical Review* (Jan.) He says:

“Our present fashion of thinking is to set the individual down in a much lower place than he used to occupy. There was a time when men thought of themselves as the creators rather than the creatures of life and progress. The great man believed, and the small man believed with him, that he was making history. It was not human society and its forces which determined the achievements, and unknown to themselves, the very ambitions of men, molding the individuals who imagined they were molding it, but it was these individuals who created conditions, formed the forces of human life, and did of their own unordered wills the things which men wrote down as the history of mankind. This habit of thought has passed by. Men think less loftily of themselves. Our current philosophies look upon man as a pushed being. The creative life of the world is the great and real energy. What happens to the world and what men do comes not out of individual will and initiative, but from the general social tendency, from the upward push of the world’s organic life.”

As against the excessive emphasis laid in these days on

social regeneration, Dr. Speer pleads for work with the individual and asks:

"After all, is not this the only method? The Kingdom of God, the new social order which we seek, is not a thing separable from humanity. It is the association of persons in the family of God, a unity of lives made one by the intercommunication of the life of God. Look at the picture of it in the Apocalypse. What could be more intensely and socially personal, less impersonally social? The New City is a person in God's vision, a bride adorned for her husband. Its gates are personal, bearing the names of the children of Jacob, and the foundations stood in men even in the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. The city had no institutions in it, not even a church for the very Person of God is its temple, and it needs no sun, for a Soul lights it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. At the beginning and the end of the order, in the Bible view a Person stands, and one has said in a certain place: "For in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist."

In the same *Review* Dr. George H. Schodde in speaking of Old Testament Criticism makes the following statement concerning conservatism:

"One of the most comforting and encouraging facts in the whole record of Biblical criticism has been this, that while the neological theories have changed from generation to generation, and what one generation of scholars lauded to the skies as the *non plus ultra* of scientific results those of their own class that followed rejected and derided, on the other hand there has never been a lack of those who have consistently and persistently defended the old landmarks of faith, such as the divine character of these records, their inspiration, their historical reliability, their unique character, etc., and who have done so in a manner which called forth the respect even of their most ardent adversaries. The old truths have never

lacked defenders and never will, although on some of the minor details of conservative claims, such as the manner of inspiration, a modification of views may have taken place."

"Indeed, all of these discussions, even the most rapid and radical, have indirectly and directly proved a blessing to the Church by compelling the defenders of the traditional convictions to examine into the why and the wherefor of their faith as they would not otherwise have done. The example of the course of New Testament criticism is instructive in this regard. The Baur school, especially the famous—or perhaps infamous—*Life of Christ* by Strauss, forced the New Testament men to a thorough re-examination of the claims of New Testament books, with the result that now after a half dozen decades the old teachings, modified indeed in minor particulars, stand firmer than ever and that phenomenal masterpiece of lore, the *New Testament Introduction* of Professor Zahn, which is a bulwark of conservatism, stands unanswered and even unattacked."

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

LUTHERANISM AND NATIONALITY.

THE ISSUE DEFINED.

Is the Lutheran Church married to any particular language? After several generations of direful discussion that question has been answered with an emphatic negative. We know now that God's Word and Luther's doctrine can be translated into many languages.

But in some minds the question still remains whether Lutheranism in its essence and purity is not limited to some particular nationality. And, indeed, there are some plausible arguments in favor of the contention that the Lutheran faith flourishes only on the soil of a specific national genius. This question is more difficult to answer than the language question was. The reason is that national genius is more difficult to define than language, and a nationality is more difficult to weigh and measure than a language. Still, it requires no more than a superficial view to find indications that Lutheranism is most intimately connected with the German nation and most closely related to the national genius of the Teutons.

Most Germans are Lutherans. The religion of Luther counts about forty millions out of a total population of about sixty-eight millions in the German Empire. And the Germans of other lands are predominantly Lutheran. The greatest movement in the history of the German people is inseparably associated with the name of the founder of Lutheranism. Martin Luther was a German of the Germans, the most German of them all, and that would seem to indicate that the type of religious thought which he brought into being and which still bears his name is thoroughly German, not only in its historical origin but also in its essential nature. Then, too, the majority of the leading spirits among the German people in modern

times have come from Lutheran families. And in the German Empire of to-day the Lutheran lands of North Germany are easily the most influential.

Furthermore, most Lutherans are Germans. More than half of the Lutherans in the world are found in Germany and millions of the Lutherans in other countries are Germans of the dispersion. The German language and German literature, to say nothing of German ideas, predominate among Lutherans. This apparent partiality of the Lutheran faith for German nationality stands in striking contrast with a certain ecumenical quality that has been claimed for Calvinism. This "internationalism" of Calvinism is indicated by the wide circulation and general influence of Calvin's Institutes, by the early and zealous prosecution by the Reformed Churches of missions in heathen lands, by their tendency to cultivate "alliances" religious and political, by their zeal in fostering pacifism, and by their actual extension over the whole earth. Here, it is said, there is genuine catholicity and no predilection for any nation or tongue.

It seems, therefore, an easy step to the conclusion that Lutheranism is closely bound up with the Teutonic spirit or at least shows a distinct predisposition towards the German heart and that so far as other spirits and other hearts are concerned, Lutheranism can only be found in an adulterated state.

But once again the superficial view is wrong and figures are misleading. Lutheranism is not wedded to the national genius of the Germans. For there are whole nations outside of Germany where Lutheranism flourishes even more luxuriantly than in the land of Luther. In Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the Lutheran Church reigns not only supreme but almost unanimously. And in America there are some very good Lutherans, indeed some who are so stout in their Lutheranism that they regard Germany itself, even its most Lutheran parts, as good soil for Lutheran missionary propaganda. Moreover, the German nation is not married to Lutheranism. For she admits Roman Catholicism to her bed and board and bank account with a liberality that makes the Pope's

Church a close rival with Luther's in the graces of the German nation as a whole.

Then, too, while Martin Luther may have been a typical German and a faithful embodiment of the German spirit, yet Martin Luther and his fellow German Reformers never did claim to have invented a new religion. Nor did they claim even to have originated a new interpretation of Christianity. They only claimed to have rediscovered the original Gospel and to have introduced it into their own times. They would have been the first to deny that the religious movement of their day was the original product of their own German minds and hearts, and Luther himself would have been the last to consent that this restoration of the Pauline faith should be known by his own name or by any other distinctively German denomination.

On the other hand, the boasted internationalism of the Calvinistic system is only superficial. It is true that in affairs of international import followers of Calvin have been more conspicuous than followers of Luther. But this is due not to any special ecumenical predisposition in Calvinistic religion but to a general aggressiveness in all the works of Christian love, an aggressiveness which every theologian knows to be deeply rooted in the Calvinistic doctrine of election. In contrast with this Calvinistic internationalism of deeds stand the Lutheran catholicity of doctrine. Emulating the spirit of the ancient disciple Mary, Lutherans have cultivated the "one thing needful," and they have always looked with disapproval on the Old Testament morality of Calvin's Geneva and the legalism of Puritans and Separatists. Lutheranism has manifested the deepest kind of catholicity. The history of the Reformed Churches has been a story of constant divisions and multiform sects, with nothing whatever to correspond to the General Lutheran Conference. It is the spiritual conception of catholicity which Lutheranism embodies, and herein lies the true universalism which makes the Lutheran faith as broad as the race and makes it possible for Lutheranism to enter into a life-union not

only with every particular nationality but also with every individual.

And yet it must be admitted that there is a relation between the religion of a country and the nationality of its people. There is a relation between Lutheranism and Germanism. This is a relation not only in theory but also in history, not only in principle but also in practice.

ORIGIN OF THE QUESTION.

This whole question has been brought to the front by the present European War. It was bound to be brought forward by such a war, for war always places tremendous emphasis upon national feelings of all sorts. Especially was it to be expected in Germany in view of her comparative isolation among the nations. At a time like this, when the whole world is overwhelmed with the intensity of great emotions that inhere in racial and national aspirations, it is only natural that the land of idealism should be stirred to bethink herself very carefully of all her national and racial assets not the least of which is her religion.

Both parties to the war have called upon God, the God of Christians, Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts, the Father revealed in Jesus Christ. Has the God of Christians remained deaf to all these entreaties, or has He favored the one side while declining to help the other side? Or can it be that one and the same God is fighting on both sides of the battle-lines? Perhaps there is another alternative, that God has manifested Himself differently to the different sides. Or, better still, perhaps God is differently conceived and understood on the different sides, and perhaps this difference in conception and vision of God is due fundamentally to a difference in nationality. Then, after all, it is only a difference in the color of their national spectacles that makes both sides imagine that they are being led on by a pillar of fire which indicates God's presence and favor.

Both groups of warring nations have turned to the Bible and there found sanction for their conduct and

comfort for their distresses. Now the Bible in the original does not sanction lying and theft and murder; neither does it teach a conflict of duties. Is it possible that the translations into different languages have reproduced the spirit and content of the old book so variously as to lead millions of pious souls into armed conflict? Is the spirit of the King James translation so different from that of Doctor Luther's translation that honest men following the two must come into bloody encounter with each other? Or does the trouble lie deeper than the language of the Bible? Perhaps the difficulty is not with the Bible itself, nor with the translators, nor with the languages of the translations, but with the interpreters. Perhaps the war was precipitated from other than religious motives, and now that the disaster is upon them men turn to their Bibles and there manage to find confirmation of their views. And it is entirely possible to do this in full intellectual honesty. For this difference in interpretation is due to a difference in national point of view. Thus again nationality furnishes the religious spectacles.

Among all the Christian nations at war there has been a spontaneous increase of interest in religion and Church. This religious revival was very great at first when hostilities broke out, but as the war has dragged on it has subsided somewhat although it has not by any means disappeared. At the same time in all of the countries concerned there has been a tremendous outburst of patriotism. This, too, has declined somewhat since the beginning of the war. But everywhere, quite naturally, strenuous efforts have been made to foster both of these movements in popular feeling,—the religious and the patriotic,—and to conserve them for the furthering of the national cause. Their interests are generally reciprocal. Where State-Churchism still prevails, the two movements easily go hand in hand and, for the most part, to stimulate the one is to augment the other. On both sides of the conflict, therefore, the religious issues are more or less interwoven with the political issues. The writers and thinkers of a nation, out of loyalty to the nation's cause and in devotion to the nation's life, must set forth by

every possible argument the justice of their own national cause and the unrighteousness of the enemy's cause, the complete superiority of their own motives and morality and form of religion over that of their enemies. And so once again religion is under the star of nationality.

LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT.

In a great variety of forms this general question is being discussed. Can the universalism of the Christian religion be maintained? How does Christianity compare with other ethnic religions in its influence upon national life, in its adaptation to particular nationalities, in its preference for particular types of the race? Are some peoples essentially more religious than others? Must we speak of a German religion and an English religion, an Oriental Christianity and an Occidental Christianity? Does the Protestant form of Christianity exert a more profound influence upon the life of the people than any other form? These and many other aspects of the general question—religion and nationality—are being discussed everywhere, but more fully and more thoroughly in Germany than anywhere else. This is partly because Germany still has State-Churchism and partly because of the idealism and the deep inward nature of the Germans. In a multitude of ways the question recurs in current German religious and theological literature.

It is impossible even to mention here all of the current literature bearing on this subject. The following list of only a few of the most recent articles, essays, and books on various aspects of the topic will serve to indicate how generally it has begun to occupy the minds of writers and readers:

Ed. König, "Deutschlands weltpolitische und sittlich-religiöse Stellung im Feuer englisch-amerikanischer Kritik." *Der Geisteskampf der Gegenwart*, November, 1915.

G. Heinzelmann, "Die Bibel im Lichte des Krieges." *Do*, August, 1915.

- P. Feine, "Nation, Kultur, Religion." *Internationale Monatsschrift*. Number 5, 1915.
- O. Ritschl, "Die christliche Religion und der Krieg." *Do*, Number 7, 1915.
- Schlosser, "Deutsches Christentum." *Deutsch-Evangelische Monatsblätter*, October, 1915.
- H. Euler, "Deutsche Religion." *Do*, August, 1915.
- D. Schnedermann, "Vom rechten deutschen Christentum in unserer grossen Zeit." *Do*, March, April, 1915. This is one of the most complete and careful discussions.
- L. Lemme, "Bankerott des Christentums." *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, September 24, 1915.
- W. Nithack-Stahn, Politik und Moral, *Christliche Welt*, July 22, 1915.
- H. Mulert, "Religion und Volkstum," *Do* August 12, 19, September 2, 1915.
- W. Koehler, "Papsttum und Weltkrieg," *Do*, July 22, 29, 1915.
- J. Herzog, "Englische und deutsche Moral im Lichte des Weltkrieges," *Do*, September 2, 1915.
- K. Bornhäuser, "Nation und Religion im Frankreich der Gegenwart," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, March, 1915.
- Lueder, "Luthertum und Volkstum," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May, 1915.
- K. Dunkmann, "Die Zukunft des Protestantismus im neuen Deutschland," *Die Reformation*, February 6, 1915.
- G. Hoennicke, "Katholische Kirche und Judentum" *Preussische Jahrbücher*, March, 1915.
- S. Feist, "Der Weltkrieg und das Rasseproblem," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, April, 1915.
- A. Deissmann, "Der Krieg und die Religion."
- A. Titius, "Unser Krieg."
- Do*, "Deutschtum und Menschentum."
- R. Seeberg, "Krieg und Kulturfortschritt."
- W. Walther, "Deutschlands Schwert durch Luther geweiht." Fourth edition. 62 pp. Leipzig, 1915.

W. Herrmann, "Die Türken, die Engländer und wir deutschen Christen."

M. Scheler, "Der Genius der Krises und der deutsche Krieg." 443 pp. Leipzig, 1915.

W. Bousset, "Unser Gottesglaube und der Krieg."

E. Mahling, "Religiöse und nationale Wiedergeburt."

RELIGION INFLUENCES NATIONALITY.

It is pointed out that in the course of history certain nations manifest a clear predisposition towards certain religions. This occurs so frequently that some scholars are disposed to regard such religious predisposition as a divine predestination, and they feel that the special mission of a nation is to be found in cultivating a particularistic national religion. The Jews, for example, were called out from among the other nations in order that they might become the channels of a special revelation. Their nationality and their religion are inseparable. Race and religion are practically identical with them, in name and in fact. Their particularity among the nations, its origin and its continuance, they owe to their religion.

Of the several forms of the Christian religion the Orthodox Church is closely connected with the national life of the Slavic nations. Like a protecting sheath Orthodox Christianity preserved the Russians at the time of the Mongolian invasions and shielded the Balkan peoples during the long centuries of Turkish dominion. And the Latin races in the Romantic countries of Europe today owe their national distinctiveness not so much to their modified descent from Roman blood as to the historical influence of the Roman Church, the one element of stability in the confusion that followed the Teutonic invasions of the Roman Empire.

As between Catholic and Protestant Christianity in western Europe, there is a very clear tendency for Catholicism to maintain its hold upon the Latin countries of the south, while Protestantism finds its best soil among the Teutonic peoples farther north. This difference between the two branches of Christianity in the West split

the Netherlands and ultimately made of them the two separate kingdoms of Holland and Belgium.

Among the Anglo-Saxons of England the spirit of Cromwell and his Puritan commonwealth has been the most active and influential, and this according to a very recent but very popular theory has been farther to the modern spirit of commercialism and capitalism so rife among English and Americans. If Puritanism with its strong coloring of Old Testament legalism has been instrumental in moulding the character and determining the history of the English people of the Island Kingdom, no less has religion, and that too in the form of Calvinistic Christianity, been a vital factor in the origin and life of the English-speaking republic of North America. For the history of the United States, in its beginnings and for several generations thereafter, reads like a chapter borrowed from the Church History of Europe.

Such considerations lead to the conclusion that the essential nature of a people is determined above all else by historical factors. The most important of these historical factors is religion. Racial descent may be an important element in determining the character of a people. Political relationships may have much to do with the forming of the national genius. But more important than physical descent or political institutions are such historical factors as language and religion. Some writers reason thus: "Nationalities are not the product of physical generation but of historical events. But historical events are under the control of the Creator who assigns them their direction and their goal. The nations therefore are divinely ordained. They are not brought into existence by the ordinary cause of nature nor do they spring into being by accident. They are created. Their Creator must have had some purpose in creating them. To discover this purpose is to discover the divine will. The divine purpose in creating a particular nation is that nation's principle of life. To help a nation discover its distinctive mission, the purpose for which it was divinely predestined, is to baptize that nation in the fountain of perpetual youth. And to help a nation to achieve its God-

given mission is to attain loftier purposes and a higher life."

Sometimes this course of reasoning is held to justify national religions as sufficient and complete in themselves. Each nation, it is said, should cultivate its own particularistic religion to the exclusion of all other nations and religions. This thought strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of warring people, and some very good people have begun to speak of a "German Christianity" and to sing the praises of "the German God." But such religious exclusiveness would contradict one of the essential elements in the religion of Jesus Christ, namely, its universalism, and to set up such a national religion would be as unhistorical as to repristinate the worship of the tribal and local deities of primitive peoples.

NATIONALITY INFLUENCES RELIGION.

This suggestion to delimit Christianity by nationalizing it must be regarded as the monstrous offspring of very unusual circumstances in lands where religious and patriotic motives are closely and unnaturally interwoven and at a time when war has brought both sets of emotions to a flood tide of passion. It is only a passing fancy and many strong voices of protest have been raised to warn against the danger. But the mere fact that the suggestion could be made at all by serious men points to a truth that is deeply ingrained in the very essence of Christianity itself, namely, its special appeal to each and every nation, its universal adaptedness to all peoples and all nationalities.

Christianity is as broad as the human race and as deep as human nature. No race or nation can monopolize it or exhaust its treasures. It is universal in its essence, in its appeal, and in its redemptive power. It makes a special appeal to each particular nationality. And therein lies the strongest proof of the absoluteness and universality of our religion, in the fact that it can enter into a special relationship with each distinctive people and can arouse and satisfy the deepest needs that

slumber in the soul of that people. In these various relationships and these varied appeals our religion unfolds the rich diversity of its content. We have already seen that Christianity has had a different kind of influence on different nationalities. But the converse is also true: various nations have variously conceived and interpreted Christian truth. Let three examples suffice.

The first people outside of Palestine to come under the influence of Christianity were the Greeks. What they found in Christianity we easily understand when we consider how they conceived of redemption. Their theologians, following the lead of Irenaeus, placed in the center of their thought the great contrast between death and life. This is a genuinely Greek conception. The separation from God is death; the union with Him is life. As Christ leads men to see God, He brings life. For as those who see the light stand in the light and receive its lustre, so those who see God are in God and receive His glory. This divine splendor is eternal life, and this eternal life through Christ stands in sharp contrast to the hopeless death that overtakes everything else in the world. These are tones that have their foundations in the Gospel of Jesus, but they are played on Greek instruments and thereby receive their coloring.

Next to the Greeks came the Latins. Among them the Greek longing for life was not forgotten but it retired to a secondary place and became, as it were, an undertone. Among the Latin theologians, following the lead of Tertullian, the scene of the divine operation in redemption is shifted from the world at large to the individual human soul. And the center of thought is no longer the contrast between death and life but that between sin and righteousness. The human soul, which is "by nature Christian," longs for relief from sin, for renewing; and redemption is the divine act of purging a man of sin and making him righteous. This thought also has its roots in the Gospel but it is the expression of the Latin mind. For that reason this conception of redemption lived on and still lives on in Roman Catholicism, the Christianity

of the Romance peoples, who are the heirs of the ancient Latins.

After the Greeks and the Latins came the Germans. If it be asked what special conception of the Gospel and of redemption the Germans hold, the answer is to be found in the Reformation. Evangelical Christianity, the Christianity of the Reformation, may be regarded as the specifically German conception. Here again it must be said that the net gains of ancient times were not ignored. The Greek longing after life in God and the Latin craving after righteousness through God are present also in the Christianity of the Reformation. But Christian thought is now gathered about a new center, namely, the gracious will of God. With unswerving consistency Luther broke into pieces the Roman conception of merit and with inexorable logic he pointed out that all human righteousness is incomplete and that even the divine renewing of man is incomplete in this life. The hope of salvation can never rest upon anything that man is or may become. Man needs God. And so Luther built up his entire system about the gracious will of God who is greater than our heart in that He forgives us our sins. Our entire being, present and future, rests solely on the merciful will of God. This is the very heart of German Christianity and this is the one thing on which all German Protestantism agrees. Here again we have a thought that is fundamental in the Gospel of Christ but at the same time specially adapted to the German soul.

AS TO LUTHERANISM.

Must we conclude, then, that Lutheranism, the Christianity that obtained in Luther's Reformation, is limited to the German soul and can flourish only on that soil? By no means. On close analysis it will be observed that Luther's understanding of the process of redemption, unlike the Greek and the Latin understanding, goes to the very heart of human nature. In Lutheranism we have the most complete expression of the subjective side of the process of salvation. That is to say, in Lutheranism we

have the most complete regard for personality, the most thorough appreciation of man as man. Now it is this very emphasis upon the principle of personality, the infinite value of the human soul, that lies at the very basis of the universalism of Christianity itself. Hence Lutheranism, although it first came to light on the genial soil of the deep German soul, nevertheless seems to reach the very heart of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the theology of the Apostle Paul, and this was the only hope and claim of its founders. And for this very reason Lutheranism can never be the exclusive possession of any particular race or nation, but is applicable wherever there are human souls capable of worshipping God.

It was no mere accident that the epoch-making book on "Christian Liberty," that splendid paean to personality, came from the pen of the founders of Lutheranism. Neither was it an accident that the doctrine of the general priesthood of believers originated in Lutheranism. Both of these ideas have entailed effects that have reached far beyond the bounds of Germany and have profoundly influenced the most varied forms of human activity. The former restored man to his God-given dignity. The latter emancipated the Christian faith from the strangling limitations of mediating priesthood, of language and form, of times and places, and ultimately led men forth to cross the seas and tramp the continents building new nations and cultivating new enterprises. This simply illustrates the universal quality in Lutheranism.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ABDINGDON PRESS. NEW YORK.

Old Testament History. By Ismar J. Peritz, Ph.D., Professor in Syracuse University. Cloth, 8 vo. Pp. 336. Price \$1.50 net.

Of the making of books on the Old Testament there seems to be no end. In recent years we have the long (and as yet incomplete) series of Prof. Charles Foster Kent, the books of Dr. H. P. Smith in the International Series, the English books—such as Ottley's and Wade's—the excellent handbook of President Frank K. Sanders, and now comes this one, itself the forerunner of a new series of Bible text-books. The books which we have mentioned are distinctively on the Old Testament, but the Old Testament is covered in various other series of Bible study courses and Teacher Training Courses. The publisher's announcement says the present series is designed to meet the needs of college classes in their regular work and is prepared upon the basis of a course agreed upon by a committee of the Association of College instructors. It is intended for use as a college text-book, and as such it is to be judged.

The volume bears the title "Old Testament History." For the class of students for whom it is intended this title is a misnomer, as the problem of higher criticism lies beyond their horizon, and the author frankly presents "the results achieved" by Old Testament criticism—at about the Graf-Wellhausen appraisalment. A fitter title would be The Critical Re-statement of Old Testament History. That this is the case one has but to look at the Table of Contents: Part One—The Formative Period; Part Two—The Period of the Prophets; Part Three—The Period of the Priests and Scribes (Mosaism). In view of this accepted reversal of the Old Testament order it is confusing to have the author proceed to use the material as it stands in the Bible, particularly as the discussion is chiefly a statement of the critical reconstruction, at times all the space given to an event, as pp. 72-78 on the Crossing of the Red Sea, being occupied with a re-printing of the author's assortment of the Bible text. Why do not these writers begin their books with the Book

of Judges and the early Songs and feed in the material as they believe it was written? Nothing would put the critical theory to a fairer test, and it would be fairer to the student.

The order of material is followed as it is in the Old Testament, but the author does not accept this as a historical order. As to the patriarchs, he leaves us in doubt as to whether he holds them as ideal personifications or tribal personifications. They are more than "the glorified mirage" of Wellhausen, but how much more? At page 87 the author states his position as to Israel's religion frankly: "The Biblical tradition clearly makes Moses Israel's discoverer of Jehovah and the medium by whom Jehovah becomes the God of Israel. What the religious conceptions of the tribes were prior to Moses is no longer clearly discernable, for the superior force of the Jehovah religion drove the others from the field. Arguing from analogy of the growth of religions in general and the primitive stages of other Semitic religions, it has been concluded that the religion of Jehovah was preceded among the Hebrews by the various stages of animism and fetichism, and ancestor worship; but these manifestations lie far back of the historical period. It appears more probable that what immediately preceded the religion of Moses was a polytheistic nature religion in which the divinity bore the designation of *El*. . . . These *Elim* were already conceived as individual deities, dwelling at fountains, trees, on mountains, or in sanctuaries consisting of simple stone altars, rude stone pillars (*mazzeboth*), and approached with offerings and animal sacrifices."

No book which proceeds on that basis can rightly call itself Old Testament history. The sources know of only one God—not a plurality of gods (for even the *ilani* of the cuneiform tablets quoted by the author is construed in the singular in the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets)—the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who revealed Himself to Moses. The Israelites not only distinguished in general a pre-Mosaic period of their development, but Moses explicitly connected his mission with the religion of the Patriarchs. The God of Moses had already been the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ex. 6:2, 3). Moses built upon the foundation laid by Abraham, and his mission would have been unintelligible apart from that of Abraham. His success depended upon the fact that he could appeal to the God of the fathers. *This* is Old Testament history, and no treatment of the subject that overlooks

this fact—no matter what theory of the literary composition of the books may be held—has a right to this title.

The volume before us is an exhibit of what the critical method of Bible study is likely to yield. The method swallows up the matter. As in the old diagram system of studying English we got the "tree" but lost all appreciation of the content of the exercise, so here, in the game of assigning "values" to the various sections of the sources, we get the "method" but lose the message.

In expressing this dissent from the findings of Prof. Peritz, we are not unmindful of the excellent work he has done in this book. He has incorporated very skillfully the main contributions of archaeology to Old Testament history, though we differ frequently from his use of it, and he has shown excellent judgment in the amount of space given to the several epochs of Israel's history. So well do we like the form and literary style of the book that it is a matter of keen regret that we cannot commend it without exception.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

Jerusalem to Rome. By Charles Fremont Sitterly. Professor in Drew Theological Seminary. Royal 8vo. Cloth binding. Pp. 293. Price \$1.50 net.

The sub-title of this sumptuous volume reveals its true character more fully and clearly than the title: "The Acts of the Apostles; a New Translation and Commentary with Notes, Maps, Reconstructions and Reproductions of Choice Illustrations from Christian Art."

As a commentary this volume is somewhat unique. A paragraph from the Preface will indicate the attitude of Professor Sitterly towards the book of Acts, and also give a taste of his style of writing: "After the Gospels, the Acts is the most fascinating book of the Bible. It is historical drama, with all the appealing power of such literature. The stage is the Roman empire. The scenes fall in the homes, market places, high-roads, sea-lanes, temple precincts, and law courts of every province and chief city from Judea to the Capital. The actors include every social stratum from the lowest slave-girl to the Emperor himself, bringing forward kings, queens, prelates, soldiers, sailors, dyers, weavers, smiths, dagger-men, beggars, thieves, outlaws, magicians, mobs, and, above all, hosts of good, pious, plain people, and some saints. The time covers a single generation, that immediately following the crucifixion, from 30 to 63 A. D."

Following the Preface is an "Introduction" which

covers 13 pages. This is written in a popular rather than a technical style. It is not wanting, however, in scholarly features, especially such as the "Chronological Outline of the Acts," a table of passages referring to the Holy Spirit, another table of the quotations in the Acts from the Old Testament, a list of the "Chief Addresses" found in the book, and a list of "the Journeys Referred to."

Next in order we have a very full and complete "Analysis of the Book" in which it is divided into three periods: A. The Jewish Period; B. the Period of Transition; C. the Gentile Period. In the further analysis the usual division into 28 chapters is followed, but the old division of the chapters into verses is dropped.

In the body of the book, the text of the new translation is printed in clear, bold type on the right-hand page, while "commentary" is printed on the left-hand page in much smaller type. This commentary is more of the nature of a paraphrase of the text than the customary critical notes and explanations which are usually found in a commentary. It is all the more pleasing because of this, and it is full enough to include a great deal of additional matter that throws much light on the text. What the publishers say in their advertisement is true, that "the commentary reads like a romance." This fact at once sets it apart from the ordinary commentary and puts it into a class by itself.

The "new translation," like many other modern translations, such as "Weymouth's" and "the Twentieth Century New Testament," is an attempt to render the book in what Professor Sitterly calls "vernacular English." This work is very well done, indeed. As a sample of it we quote a part of Paul's address to the Areopagus: "Men of Athens, I observe on all hands how very religious you are. For as I was going along and looking at your objects of worship I even found an altar with the inscription: 'To an unknown God.' Whom, then, you worship without knowing Him, I am now proclaiming to you. The God who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in man-made shrines, nor is He served by human hands as though He lacked anything, for He is the One who gives to all men life and breath and everything else. Moreover, He made from one source every race of men to live on all the face of the earth, and determined their allotted seasons and the limits of their settlement, so that they might search for God if perchance they might feel their way to Him and find Him, especially as He is not far

from every one of us. For it is in Him that we live and move and exist, just as some of your own poets have said, 'For His offspring also are we.' "

The volume is embellished and enriched by numerous maps, and nearly 40 illustrations, many of them full-page reproductions of the best things in Christian art touching on the story, and including careful "reconstructions" of the six chief centers about which the history recorded in the Acts revolves, Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth and Rome.

Our chief criticism of the make-up of the volume is that neither in the analysis of the book, nor in any of the tables in the Introduction are any pages given. As there is no Index, this makes it very difficult and inconvenient to find any particular passage or to turn to it with any ease, or without loss of time.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

The Truth of the Apostles' Creed. An Exposition of Twelve Theologians of Germany. Edited by William Laible, D.D. Translated by Charles E. Hay, D.D. Cloth. Size 5 x 7½ inches. Pp. 217. Price \$1.00 net.

This is really a notable little book in whose praise we can not say too much. It is the outgrowth of recent attacks by the "liberal," rationalistic school of German theologians on the venerable Apostles' Creed. It was their boast that no scientific theologian could be found who would be willing or able to stand in its defense. The editor of the *Allgemeine Ev. Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* accepted the challenge, and, in the summer of 1913, invited leading theologians to come to the defense of the Church by contributing articles on the twelve leading doctrines or thoughts of the Creed. These articles were afterward gathered in book form, and have been translated into excellent idiomatic English by Dr. Hay and published in good style by the Lutheran Publication Society. There are really thirteen chapters and as many authors, including a historical chapter by Dr. N. Bonwetsch of Goettingen.

The array of names and of universities at once gives the readers the assurance of competent scholarship. Beside Dr. Bonwetsch and Dr. T. Kaftan, the noted General Superintendent of Schleswig, we have Dunkman and

Haussleiter from the University of Greifswald, Gruetzmacher, Wohlenberg, and Bachman from Erlangen, Althaus and Ihmels from Leipsic, Schlatter from Tuebingen, Walther from Rostock, Weber from Bonn, and Bornhäuser from Marburg.

These noble Christian teachers have born testimony to the historicity and to the reality of the most universal Creed, and have done much to arrest the progress of the arrogant and destructive assertions of those who would undermine the faith of the Church. The attack is not simply on the Creed but on the Bible and Christianity. The publication, therefore, of the present volume of moderate size and price, written in simple language is doubly welcome.

There are many in our own land who have been led to believe that faith can no longer be found in the universities of the Fatherland. To these this excellent defense of the Creed will come as a happy surprise, not simply because of its apologetic character but also because of deeply religious spirit which animates it. The authors write from a rich personal experience of the great truths set forth in the Creed.

The book is a piece of fine constructive work by up-to-date men. It rests upon the conservative teachings of the Reformation. A remarkable unity pervades the volume; there is scarcely a discordant note.

The Church will never give up the Apostles' Creed. It has sung its way into the heart by its rhythm as well as by its teaching. The doctrines of the Trinity, and of salvation as the work of the Triune God are its simple but deep message, which it has graven upon the memory of all the generations. Let it not be thought that its constant use in public service is a vain repetition. It is an antidote or, better, a prophylactic against the poison of false doctrine.

Pastors will do well to place this book upon their shelves. It will help them in preaching and in catechizing. They should also commend it to their people.

J. A. SINMASTER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Catechism Bible Narratives. By Rev. Geo. W. Lose. Royal 8vo. Cloth binding. Pp. 410. Price 75 cents.

The title to this splendid volume is somewhat misleading. At least, it does not give a very clear or correct idea of the contents. The sub-title is scarcely more illumi-

nating, "A Series of Bible Narratives on the Five Chief Parts of Luther's Smaller Catechism. For Use in Lutheran Sunday Schools." The difficulty probably is that the author is working along a line so entirely new that it is not easy to express the real purpose of the book in a brief title or in a few words.

More light comes from the Preface in which the author, who is a Joint Synod of Ohio pastor, says: "We of the Lutheran Church are particularly anxious to familiarize as many as possible with the chief truths of the Bible as they are set forth in Luther's catechism. It is the purpose of this series of lessons to render assistance in this grand work of the Church by explaining the truth as we have it in our beloved catechism in the light of illustrations taken from the Word of God—either narratives or pertinent passages." But even this still leaves us in the twilight, if not in the dark.

A circular letter from the publishers, sent out with the volume, explains more fully the purpose of the author in preparing this volume and the way in which it is intended to be used. In this we read: "Experience has taught that the catechism as such is taught in relatively few Sunday Schools. True, in many schools the catechism text is memorized, and in some it is explained by the pastor, but in very few schools have classes been arranged in which the catechism is used as a text-book. The reason assigned for this is that the average lay teacher does not feel himself able to teach the catechism though he usually teaches a Bible narrative quite acceptably. It was therefore thought that by joining the catechism with well selected Bible narratives it ought to be possible for the lay teacher to teach the main catechism truths on the basis of Biblical histories. In this volume an effort is made to combine the catechism with Bible narratives and it is hoped that the author has succeeded in preparing a text-book that will materially help to solve the problem of teaching the catechism in Sunday Schools."

The plan followed in the book is to select two or three Bible stories, or "pertinent passages," bearing on each of the questions and answers in the catechism. These selections are printed in full with suggestive paragraph headings. They are also quite fully annotated. That is, each passage is followed by explanatory notes and comments, with a great many numeral references from the notes to the text and also to the questions which follow, so that it is almost impossible for either the teacher or the pupil to go astray as to either the meaning or the ap-

plication of the notes. These notes are followed again by a series of questions intended to bring out in answer both the story or Scripture lesson, and the comments made in the explanatory notes. If these several helps were to be used faithfully as intended, it would be hard to see how any catechumen could fail to get a very clear and full understanding both of the Bible narrative and of the particular part of the catechism illustrated or enforced.

The course is arranged to cover two years, with a lesson for every week, and it is explained that they are intended for children of about thirteen or fourteen years of age. We cannot see why they should not prove very helpful to much older pupils as well. There are generally two, sometimes more than two, lessons used to illustrate each question or subordinate topic in the catechism. For example, on the Fourth Commandment, there are two lessons, the first one being "Absalom's Rebellion" based on the fifteenth chapter of Second Samuel, and the second lesson being "Jesus Subject to His Parents" based on Luke, 2:41-52. There are also frequent "Reviews" usually covering not more than from three to five lessons.

We doubt whether it will be found practicable to use this volume as intended in the Sunday School. But we believe that it might be used to great advantage in the regular catechism classes, especially for the Junior Class made up of younger children who are expected to be under instruction for two or three years before being confirmed. Pastors themselves would find it very suggestive and helpful in preparation for the work of teaching a class in the catechism.

To facilitate and encourage the use of the book in classes a special price is made of fifty cents each in dozen lots. The series of lessons is published also in leaflet form at six cents per quarter, or twenty cents per year.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Influence of Lutheranism Outside of the Lutheran Church. By Jacob A. Dell. Pamphlet. Large 8vo. Pp. 16. Price 6 cents.

This is an interesting discussion of a subject that is certainly of interest at least to all Lutherans, especially as we approach the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation. The subject is presented under a number of definite headings, such as, "The Influence of Lutheranism on the Enemies of Luther," "On the Principles of Government," "Upon Liberty in General," "Upon Literature and Education," "On Religion." For purposes of general circulation the pamph-

let is sold at 50 cents per dozen copies, or \$3.50 per hundred.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE HOWARD SEVERANCE CO. CHICAGO.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia. James Orr, M.A., D.D., General Editor. John L. Nuelsen, D.D., LL.D., and Edgar Y. Mullins, D.D., LL.D., Asst. Editors. Morris O. Evans, D.D., Ph.D., Managing Editor. Buckram binding. Size 7½ x 11 inches. Complete in five volumes. Whole number of pages xix 3541. Price \$30.00.

This is an age of great dictionaries and encyclopaedias, and none of them is without value. Probably each excels all the rest in some particulars; but it is not easy to decide which one is the best if only one is desired. Nevertheless the work under review makes a strong bid for acceptance on the ground that it is convenient in form, excellent in paper and print, comprehensive in scope, moderate in price, and above all conservative in attitude. The general editorial supervision of the late distinguished scholar, Dr. James Orr, is a pledge of thoroughness and of true conservatism in theology and criticism. The purpose that pervades these volumes is to present the facts and the teachings of the Bible in a sympathetic way. There is no attempt at ingenious theories by which to explain away or to minimize the divine origin and character of the Scriptures. The assured results of investigation and criticism are accepted at their true value. The advanced Wellhausen theories are rejected as contrary to reason and to fact. This cyclopaedia marks a halt in the march of destructive higher criticism. Special attention is given to archaeology, probably more than by any other of the great dictionaries.

The contributors were selected for their special fitness from many lands. However, of the two hundred, over one-half are Americans. This feature makes an appeal to us, because if we may thus judge the better their competency and have the assurance that they look at problems from our own viewpoint.

There is also the manifest purpose of impartiality in the treatment of doctrines concerning which there is an honest difference of opinion. Such subjects therefore, as the sacraments are discussed by denominational authors of diverse tendencies. Perhaps even these may

fail to satisfy their own constituents; but that is not the fault of the editors. Occasionally the latter warn the reader that articles are admitted, but not approved in all respects.

The loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God is a central principle of this cyclopaedia. Nevertheless there is occasionally a somewhat uncertain note, as for instance in the article on Authority. "Inspiration" is adequately treated by Dr. Warfield, and the "Bible" by Dr. Orr.

In reference to the Atonement, the article directly treating the subject is somewhat vague but the articles on Reconciliation and Sacrifice bring out clearly the divine side of the atonement and the propiatory ideas involved in sacrifice.

The Virgin Birth is maintained as divinely taught and as necessary to the incarnation. The reality of angels—good and evil—is defended. Miracles are held to be necessary to a scheme of salvation. The article on evolution is discriminating if not altogether convincing. In the article on the Lord's Supper by Henry E. Dosker, the Lutheran Church is charged with teaching "consubstantiation." As Lutherans have always repudiated this charge, we are sorry to see it repeated here.

Taking it all in all *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* merits the approbation of Christian scholars and deserves a place among the great dictionaries of the Word of God.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS. NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Miscellaneous Inscriptions. Yale Oriental Series. Babylonian Texts, Vol. I. By Albert T. Clay. Demy quarto. Pp. vi. 108 + Plates LV. Printed November, 1915, 500 copies. Mary Stevens Hammond Fund. Price \$5.00.

With this beautiful volume, printed on heavy calendared paper, Prof. Clay inaugurates the Yale Babylonian Texts, giving the public their first taste from the rich treasure-house over which he presides. This collection, which now numbers about 8,000 Sumerian and Akkadian inscriptions and other antiquities, is one of great reputed value; and if this volume is a fair sample, future publications will be awaited with eager interest. Prof. Clay has selected fifty-three of these inscriptions for reproduction and discussion. They are historical texts, votive

and building inscriptions, a dynastic list, date lists, a tablet containing the most ancient laws known, a fragment of the Chammurabi Code, a boundary stone, a mortuary inscription, a syllabary, etc.

For the Bible student interest will center in four groups of tablets. In Prof. Clay's *Amurru the Home of the Northern Semites*, he advanced the revolutionary theory, based upon unchallenged though sweeping etymologies, that the name Gilgamesh, the hero of the Babylonian Flood Story (from which, most critics hold, the Bible writers borrowed the Flood Story of Genesis), contains undoubted West Semitic elements, which relate the name with the name Damascus. Prof. Clay believes that the mountain Mashu of the Gilgamesh epic and Ki-Mash-ki of the early inscriptions refer to the district and city of Damascus; also that Ki-Mash-ki or Mash-ki ("the place of Mash"), is preserved in Mesheq (Gen. 15:2), and that the god of this district was carried into Babylonia in a very early period, in proof of which the author cites many names of early Babylonian kings combined with this element. In inscription 3 of the volume before us, an archaic inscription, found on a lime-stone mace-head, written in Sumerian, the Erichian hero Gilgamesh has already become a demi-god. A nest of Erichian names compounded with Mash shows further that the name has long been common. Gilgamesh is further called Mer-aba-du in this inscription. Here Clay finds another West Semitic element, confirming his theory.

No. 32 is the Larsa dynastic tablet from Senkereh, the ancient city of Larsa. The list shows that the theory that King Warad-Sin (which can be read Uri-Aku=Arioch) was the contemporary of Chammurabi (the Amraphal of Gen. 14) the sixth king of the first Babylonian dynasty, must be given up, as the two could not be contemporary. Rim-Sin, the successor of Warad-Sin, Clay thinks, is the Arioch of the Genesis narrative, and the fact that he was an older contemporary of Chammurabi, when the Babylonian dynasty is still subservient to Larsa, seems to correspond with the coalition of kings given in Gen. 14.

No. 28 is a Sumerian prototype of the Chammurabi Code and is said to have come from Warka, the ancient city of Erech. The 4th law legislates with respect to the son who renounces his sonship, receives his portion and leaves home. He is thereby legally separated from his family. Henceforth he has the status of a slave. It was

a prudential provision against a son's securing anything additional from the estate of his father. It probably throws light on the parable of the Prodigal Son (Lk. 15), not only by showing how true to ancient custom the story is, but by giving us the background against which to estimate the father's act of love.

Nos. 46-51 are from a nest of Erch account tablets, which are dated in the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses. Text 50 is translated and explained. It belongs to the 5th year of Cambyses and is an account of sacrificial sheep. The offering occurred on the 7th, the 14th, the 21st, the 28th of the month. These tablets come nearer to showing a parallel to the Jewish Sabbath among the Babylonians than had previously been found. But Clay still rejects the Babylonian origin of the Sabbath: first, there is no root in Assyrian from which *shappatum* in the sense of שַׁבָּת can be derived; secondly, the Hemerology of the Babylonians (familiar for the oft-quoted restriction upon the conduct of the king) makes no provision for the common people—they did not observe the fast-day of the king, but, to the contrary, the contract tablets show as much work done on that day as any other; thirdly, the somberness and austerity of the days of the Hemerology, at least for the ruler, can best be explained as an importation from the West. There is nothing native in Babylonian life to explain it, but the Hebrew Sabbath, at least as practiced in the exodus (Ex. 16:23, 26), will.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites. By Henry Schaeffer, Ph.D. 8vo., cloth. Pp. xiv, 245. Price \$2.35 net, postpaid.

This volume is a constructive study of the social institutions of the ancient Hebrews, Babylonians and Arabs. The scope of the study will be indicated by the subjects treated: Matriarchy, Patriarchy, Agnation, the Goël (Next of Kin), Slavery, Interest, Pledges and Security, the Social Problem as viewed by the Prophets, Poor Laws, the Sabbatical Year, the Year of Jubilee, Ezekiel's plan of Allotment, Taxation and Tribute, the Development of Individual Landownership in Israel. By patient and thorough research the author has gathered a wealth of material from Babylonian and Arabic sources. There is a marked resemblance in the social practice of the branches of the Semitic family, but the practice of the Hebrews is, on the whole, more humane and is actuated

by higher ethical motives. The author accepts "the assured results of criticism" with conservative discrimination. The book is written in an easy and popular style, and the preacher will find it a mine of information.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK CITY.

Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy. By Ralph Tyler Flewelling. 12mo. Pp. 227. Cloth, gold top. Price \$1.00 net.

Personalism is the word used to designate the system of philosophy held and taught by the late Professor Borden P. Bowne of Boston University. This volume is an effort by one of his former pupils and admirers to direct attention to the fundamental teaching of this philosophy by setting forth its relation to, and bearing on, some of the other dominant systems of the day. In a sub-title the volume is called "An Appreciation of the Work of Borden P. Bowne."

The other systems of philosophy especially discussed are Naturalism, as represented by Spencer especially Idealism as developed from Kantianism and Pluralistic Pragmatism as taught especially by William James. There is also a section dealing with the two great moderns, Bergson and Eucken. In each case the purpose is to point out the defects of the system under review, and to show how much truer and more satisfactory Bowne's doctrine of Personalism is. The essential thought in Personalism is, that "the universe finds its unity in the thought of a Supreme Personality, himself the unchanging cause of change." Perhaps the following extract from page 106 will make the meaning of this more clear:

"Lotze pointed out the fact that we must discover some continuity behind the ebb and flow of matter and even of human experience if we are to find out the meaning of the world. Bowne carried the thought up to secure footing and made the relation of thought and thing clear. He affirmed that the desired continuity can be found alone in personality. Personality is the only power of which we are conscious that can join the sundered experience of time and space into a unity and look upon all from the standpoint of one. Thus alone, he argues, is unity possible in the world. The universe finds its unity in the thought of a Supreme Personality, himself the unchanging cause of change."

The book is written in a simple, clear, and interesting

style, and will no doubt have the effect designed of turning many of its readers to a more careful study of Professor Bowne's own books in which his system is elaborated, especially his "Personalism."

The writer of this volume thinks that Bowne and Eucken had much in common. This thought is apparently held by Eucken himself if we may judge from a chapter contributed by himself on "The Work of Borden P. Bowne." In this chapter he speaks in very high terms of praise of Professor Bowne both as a man and as a philosopher.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Literary Primacy of the Bible. By George P. Eckman. 12mo. Cloth binding. Pp. 209. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume constitutes the second series of "The Mendenhall Lectures," delivered at DePauw University in 1915. The Mendenhall Lectureship was founded by the late Rev. Marmaduke H. Mendenhall, D.D., of the North Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by a gift of \$10,000 to the DePauw University for this purpose. The general subject of the lectures, as defined by the donor of the fund, is "The Evidences of the Divine Origin of Christianity."

There are six lectures in this series. "The Literary Primacy of the Bible" is really the title of only the first lecture, though it is used as the title of the book, and is carried as a page heading all through the volume. The subjects of the other five lectures are "The Poetry and the Oratory of the Bible," "The Fiction and Humor of the Bible," "The Bible the Most Persistent Force in Literature," "The Bible as Ethical and Spiritual Literature," and "The Bible as Inspired Literature."

The lectures are couched in popular rather than technical language, though they give ample evidence of careful scholarship and wide reading. We quote a few sentences from the third lecture on "The Fiction and Humor of the Bible." The lecturer says on page 107: "Though humor is, perhaps, the least apparent element in the literature of the Bible, rich veins of it are disclosed to one who has a feeling for its subtleties and some knowledge of the language in which it is expressed and of the racial peculiarities out of which it springs. It would be preposterous to class the Bible with facetious books, and one reason for the failure justly to appraise its humor is our proneness to test it by our modern ideas of the comic. This is

a fatal and perfectly irrational blunder. The Hebrew consciousness expressed itself in moral and religious modes. It is this which differentiates its literature, in large part, from that of other races. There is a decided flavor of morality in all genuine humor, but this quality is pre-eminently displayed in the humor of the Bible."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE PILGRIM PRESS. BOSTON, MASS.

Conversations with Luther. Selections from recently published sources of the *Table Talk*, translated and edited by Preserved Smith, Ph.D., author of "The Life and Letters of Martin Luther," &c., &c., and Herbert P. Gallinger, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History at Amherst College. Cloth, 5 x 7½. Pp. xxvii. 260. Price \$1.00 net.

Luther's *Table Talk* as is well known is made up of his familiar, informal talks with groups of friends that gathered about his hospitable board or lingered of an evening about his fireside. These talks were recorded by admiring pupils and friends and have appeared in print in German, in various editions from 1566 to the present. Only two translations have been made into English—that by Captain Henry Bell in 1652 and by William Hazlitt in 1848. The edition of Aurifaber, Luther's amenuensis at the time of his death, has until recently been the only source of knowledge of Luther's conversations; but since 1872 eight or ten new sources have been discovered. It is from these that Drs. Smith and Gallinger have gleaned much new material and incorporated it with the more important talks already known. We need hardly say that the translations and editing have been done with great care. The text is enriched with numerous foot-notes which explain allusions to persons and references to events.

These conversations show us the inimitable Luther at home with a choice circle of friends, to whom he talked on every subject under the sun. We see him as he is—intensely human, a child of his age with many of its faults, yet also a man of far vision, of wit and wisdom. Froude said of the *Table Talk* that it was "one of the most brilliant books in the world, as full of matter as Shakespeare's plays." Without these conversations Luther would hardly be known on the inner, personal side of his wonderful life.

On the eve of the 400th anniversary of the Reformation these "Conversations" are timely and will take their place with the Luther literature of permanent value.

J. A. SINMASTER.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN COMPANY. MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Ethiopic Liturgy; Its Sources, Development and Present Form. By Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in the Western Theological Seminary (Episcopal), Chicago, Ill. 8vo. Cloth binding. Pp. xvi + 487. Price \$1.50 net.

This volume is made up of the Hale Lectures for 1914-15 delivered at the Western Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in Chicago. The lecturer not only is exceptionally well equipped to do the work which he has undertaken, but he has also taken special pains to do his work thoroughly. Through the kind offices of the American and British representatives at the capital of Ethiopia he secured, early in 1914, a complete manuscript copy of the full Ethiopic liturgy as it is in use to-day in Abyssinia. Then, during the Summer of 1914, as he tells us in the preface, he examined personally "every Ethiopic liturgical manuscript in the museums and libraries of Europe (including those in Petrograd), with the exception of those in France, which on account of the war became inaccessible."

The lectures are six in number. The first three lectures are introductory in character. In them some account is given of liturgical worship in general as found among the Hebrews, and in pagan nations, before the advent of Christianity. Thus a background is laid for a discussion of the rise of liturgical forms in the Christian Church of the first four centuries. These topics occupy the first two lectures. In the third lecture we have a brief account of the introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia, or Abyssinia, and of the development of a complete Ethiopic liturgy in dependence on Alexandria.

The other three lectures are devoted to a study of the development and present form of the Ethiopic liturgy, and a comparison of the various manuscripts so as to show all the variations found. This work is done in the most careful and painstaking way. It is especially interesting and valuable because it is the first time that the complete Ethiopic liturgy has been translated and published in English.

Other interesting and valuable features of the volume are, the full Greek text of the Liturgy of St. Mark in its probable fifth century form, which, it is claimed, was the basis or earliest form of the present Ethiopic liturgy; also a photographic reproduction of the full manuscript copy of the present Ethiopic liturgy. This is made from the manuscript secured by Dr. Mercer in the Spring of 1914 and already referred to. It is known as the "Mercer Ms. 3." This alone covers 72 pages, and is of special interest because, as we understand, the Ethiopic liturgy has never been printed in the Ethiopic tongue. All the copies in use, or in existence heretofore have been in manuscript form.

All liturgical students especially, and all students of Church History, as well, owe a large debt of gratitude to Dr. Mercer for this volume on a subject which has never before received so full and satisfactory treatment. Several very full indexes add very greatly to the value and usefulness of the volume.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

JOHNSTON AND PENNEY. WEST NEWTON, PA.

Subject and Object. By Rev. Johnston Estep Walter. Cloth. 8vo. Pp. vi + 184. Price \$1.40 net.

Mr. Johnston has previously published three other philosophical works, "The Perception of Space and Matter," "The Principles of Knowledge," and "Nature and Cognition of Space and Time." A few extracts from the Preface to the last of these will give the author's philosophical standpoint. He says: "The following discussion of the Nature and our Cognition of Space and Time is grounded on the fundamental postulates of dualistic realism. It maintains the reality of space and time in contradiction to the Kantian hypothesis of ideality; space being held to be real as an independent entity, and time as an attribute or property of entities."

Again he says: "In this period of idealistic vagueness and wordiness and of eccentricity and novelties in philosophy, the positive and unequivocal advocacy of the principles of realism is likely to be imputed to the bold assertiveness that is the stronger because of ignorance of the history and trend of philosophy; or to belatedness and incompetency. It must expect satirical and slashing reprobation certainly from the followers of the Berkeleyan and Kantian idealism, and from those who are captivated with the sub-titles and pretensions of what is strangely called the new realism."

The present volume, the author announces, is based on the same realistic principles and has the same aim which is, to hasten the coming of a better day for realism, "a day when it shall have, with release from truculent disparagement, prosperity and progress, and the honor of a fair acknowledgment of its worth." In the discussion of "Subject" psychology "with a soul" is maintained with particular reference, and with particular opposition, to the psychology of Hume and those who follow him. As to the "Object," matter and the perception of it are treated with special reference to the Berkeleian immaterialism. The writer holds that Berkeley's argument against the possibility of a representative knowledge, and against the existence of external matter, admits of a fair answer. Other topics discussed are, "Subject and Object in Relation," "Nature and Perception of Matter," and "Truth." The author writes always in a very clear and readable style, so that it is easy for even a layman in philosophical discussion to follow his argument and appreciate the strength of his positions, and the meaning and force of the conclusions at which he arrives.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

The New Personality and Other Sermons. By Frederick F. Shannon, D.D. 12mo. Cloth. Pp. 205. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Shannon is the pastor of the Reformed-Church-on-the-Heights, Brooklyn, New York. He has previously published another volume of sermons under the title, "The Soul's Atlas and Other Sermons." The volume now under review contains twelve sermons the first of which gives the title to the book, "The New Personality." Other titles are "A Soul Expert," "The Dateless Christ," "False Wealth and True," "The Winds of the Soul," "The Garden of Life," "The Enchanted Pursuit," &c. From these titles one would expect to find sermons of a rather highly imaginative and descriptive character. In this the reader is not disappointed. Dr. Shannon is fruitful in thought, has a fine literary style, uses a good many illustrations and uses them very happily. He also has the gift of striking and epigrammatic expression in an unusual degree. The sermons make pleasant and stimulating reading, and will offer many suggestive lines of thought to preachers.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE CHRISTIAN HERALD. NEW YORK.

Luther in Light of Recent Research. By Heinrich Böhm, Marburg University, translated by Carl F. Huth, Jr., University of Chicago. Bound in illuminated cloth. Included in the volume is *A Pictorial Life of Luther*, being the first publication of the collection of rare prints in the possession of Rev. William Koepchen, who also contributes the descriptive text and titles, making 83 pages. Pages 318 + 89. Price \$1.50 net.

A Luther Book Mark is also issued by the *Christian Herald*. It is beautiful and artistic, woven (not printed) in blue and red and black colors, representing Luther nailing the Theses to the church door. It also gives the music and the words of one stanza of "Ein Feste Burg." It is a fitting souvenir. Price 50 cents.

Boehmer's "Luther in the Light of Recent Research" appeared in German ten years ago, and created a decidedly favorable impression. It now is given for the first time in English. The 400th Anniversary makes its appearance timely, and it will no doubt have a wide circulation.

The work is exceedingly well done by Prof. Boehmer, who brings to his task great learning, wide research and a calm judicial temper. He never yields to the temptation of denouncing the slanderers of his hero. He prefers the better way of reason and of a sly sarcasm which carries with it conviction.

The book is not a biography but rather a vindication of Luther and a philosophy of his life. It is not purely defensive but also constructive, showing the great Reformer as the creator of a new era and the prophet of a new ideal. The author has a clear and comprehensive conception of this great "modern man," and knows how to make him stand out as the courageous exponent of Christian thought and life, despite the limitations of his age and station.

The translation is spirited and reproduces the original fairly well, but does not always escape the German idiom.

This volume must be reckoned with by the Romanist and will find a ready welcome by intelligent Protestants.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

K. C. HOLTER PUBLISHING C. MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Scandinavian Immigrants in New York, 1630-1674. With Appendices on Scandinavians in South America, 1532-1640; in Canada, 1619-1620; in New York in the 18th Century; German Immigrants in New York 1630-1674. By Professor John O. Evjen, Ph.D. Cloth. Pp. xxiv + 438. Seventy Illustrations. Price \$2.50, postage extra.

Doctor Evjen has rendered an important service in a difficult field of historic research. Until quite recently this field was virgin soil, remaining untilled because of the apparent lack of clear data, the confusion of names and nationalities, and the wide diffusion of the material. But such a field tempts the man of historic instinct and training combined with indefatigable industry. After an exploration of years amid the ancient and musty records of immigration and of judicial, legislative, municipal, ecclesiastical, commercial and personal documents, found in all sorts of places, Doctor Evjen has produced a volume which is of permanent value. While it possesses general interest to all students of colonial history, it is of special interest to all Americans of Scandinavian origin.

Two-thirds of the volume are occupied with the chronicles of the immigrants, including brief biographical sketches. These are bright and interesting especially to those who find in them the record of some of their own forbears as the reviewer has done. Numerous incidents relating to conflicts with the Indians and to the daily lives of the settlers enliven the record. The Introduction and the Retrospect summarize the material included in the biographies.

The conditions, vocations and relations of the mixed population of New Amsterdam are clearly set forth and their virtues and foibles are pictured. Due attention is also given to the religious situation of those early days in which our Lutheran Church did not enjoy freedom of worship under the administration of the Dutch.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BROCHURES.

God's Word and God's Works, A clear Testimony to the Truth, Selected from the Writings of Dr. Martin Luther. Jubilee Edition. Paper. Pp. 61. Price 20 cents; by the dozen \$1.92. Published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.

This is a beautiful booklet, with a fine cover having a good portrait of Luther. The contents are the helpful and vigorous thoughts of a great soul.

The Six Days of Creation in the Light of Modern Science. By Dr. Frederick Bettex, translated by Dr. David Heagle. Paper edition. Pp. 45. Price 20 cents. Published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.

This is an excellent treatise from the Christian point of view and should have a wide circulation.

Saved to Serve, An Inner Mission Vision of the Ideal Congregation.

This booklet gives a brief exposition of Inner Missions. For a copy address the Secretary, Rev. Wm. Freas, 1053 Trinity Avenue, New York City.

Inner Mission Work treats of the same matters.

This booklet is a reprint of two chapters of Professor Edward Pfeiffer's *Mission Studies*. It is to be had from Mr. Freas.

The Doctrinal Teachings of Christian Science. By Professor J. N. Kildahl, D.D. Paper. Pp. 26. Price 10 cents.

Published by the Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis. It exposes most effectively the errors and delusions of so-called Christian Science.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY 1916.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHURCH.

(SEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION).¹

BY E. D. WEIGLE, D.D.

“Also they teach, that one holy Church is to continue forever. The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered. And to the true unity of the Church, it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike. As Paul says: One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, etc. Eph. 4:5, 6.”

The writer has been honored with the privilege and entrusted with the responsibility of discussing the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession entitled, “Of the Church.” The value and importance of the Holman Lectureship cannot easily be over-emphasized. Well into the third series covering for the third time the Twenty-one doctrinal articles of our venerable, and remarkable confession, its teachings being as fresh and up-to-date for soundness of the faith as ever, we owe a debt of

¹ A Lecture on the Holman Foundation delivered at the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 9, 1916.

gratitude which we can never discharge, to the now sainted founder, the Rev. Dr. S. A. Holman, of precious memory, and to the many who have rendered the service as lecturers, the greater part of whom have gone to their reward. Among the lecturers of the first series, we find the name of Rev. J. G. Morris, D.D., whose broad scholarship and knowledge of Reformation history qualified him to write an able lecture on the Seventh Article; Rev. Peter Bergstresser, D.D., was chosen to discuss the same article of the second series, whose profound knowledge of the Scriptures is discoverable on every page. Both these eminent ministers have gone to their reward and their work abides. It is with feelings of chastened sorrow, and a sense of real and distinct loss that we address ourselves to the work of serving our blessed Seminary in a similar attempt at putting our thoughts, on a very attractive subject, in a permanent form. During the years of these discussions in our Seminary, great, even marvelous, changes have taken place, in point of appreciation of the glorious heritage of our beloved Church, in her doctrines, history, usages and cultus. These lectures have had a large share in making known to our clergy as well as to many of our interested, intelligent laymen, the rich treasures of evangelical truth as taught, believed and confessed by the fathers of Protestantism. The passing years make it, more and more apparent, that here there is nothing to revise but, in a sense, like the Word of God itself, it will abide forever.

I wish, first of all, to acknowledge my high appreciation and personal indebtedness to these discussions of our venerable Confession. Being located in my earlier ministry at no great distance from our Seminary, I heard many of the lectures comprising the first series, and being a reader of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY from my college days, distance from where the lectures were delivered did not deny me the privilege of acquainting myself with these annual discussions. I will never be able to place a proper estimate of the value of these lectures to me, personally.

Since my appointment as lecturer for this current

Seminary year, the Seventh and the closely related Eighth Article, were made subjects of a conference essay, by one of our younger pastors. The discussion was characterized as splendid. This is as it should be. May it never be true in this day, as it was in the not remote past, that it could be said of some of our pastors that they had never even read, much less studied, this Magna Charta, of evangelical truth. Ignorance here is perilous, aye, inexcusable. Hence the need and value of such a lectureship for the lecturers and their constituency as well.

DEFINITION.

In seeking a definition of our subject it may be helpful to look into the original of the word in the Greek. Here we find the following: ἡ ἐκκλησία, —, from ἐκκλητος, called out or forth, a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place; among the Greeks an assembly of the people convened at the public place of the council for the purpose of deliberating. (Acts 19:39). In the Old Testament, in the Septuagint, the assembly of the Israelites when gathered for sacred purposes. In the New Testament, the Church in the wilderness (Acts 7:38); and in the midst of the Church (Heb. 2:12) will I sing praise unto thee. Any gathering or throng of men assembled by chance or tumultuously (Acts 19:32, 39); To feed the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood (Acts 20:28). In the Christian sense, an assembly of Christians gathered for worship; a company of Christians, or of those who, hoping for eternal salvation through Jesus Christ, observe their own religious rites, hold their own religious meetings, and manage their own affairs according to regulations prescribed for the body for order's sake, those who anywhere, in city or village, constitute such a company and are united into one body; the Church (ἐκκλησία) in one's house, i. e., the company of Christians belonging to a person's family; others less aptly understand the phrase of the Christians accustomed to meet for worship in the homes of some one. From I Cor. 14:23, it appears that

the whole Corinthian Church was accustomed to assemble in one and the same place.

The name ἡ ἐκκλησία is used also by Christ while on earth of the company of His adherents in any city or village (Matt. 18:17). He uses the name here in connection with Christian discipline. The whole body of Christians scattered throughout the earth, collectively, all who worship and honor God and Christ in whatever place they may be are spoken of under this name (Matt. 16:18). The name is transferred to the assembly of faithful Christians already dead and received into heaven (Heb. 12:23).

It may be well to let the Biblical idea of the Church disclose itself as it stands forth in both the Old and the New Testaments. In the theophanies and visions of the Old Testament, notably the appearance of God to Moses in the burning bush; in the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night; in the tabernacle and subsequent temple arrangements, as well as the place the synagogue filled during the captivity, and even to, and during, the time of Christ, we have a prefiguration of the Christian Church in type and shadow of the better and fuller dispensation of the Gospel. The inauguration of the Christian Church, as it is known in ecclesiastical history, dates from Pentecost when in answer to long-continued and unanimous prayer of the one hundred and twenty disciples in the now sacred upper room in obedience to Christ's parting command, the promised power came in a miraculous manner, and when in response to one sermon, preached in the power of the Holy Ghost by the infant Church's foremost apostle, three thousand were added to the Church, under the ministrations of the believers, in the glow and zeal inspired by the newly received gift of power, the Church grew and multiplied, until the small number, at the beginning, leaped into the number of seven thousand and more before the tragic death of Stephen,—the first martyr. The summary discipline of Ananias and Sapphira who under the appearance of great and sincere benevolence, in the interests of the poor, lied to the Holy Ghost, even increased greatly the

number of those who were won to the new way, and, the record says, "A great company of the priests were obedient to the faith,"—this latter effect being a resultant, in a measure, because of the appointment of deacons, for the ministration of the benevolence, in the interest of poor Grecian widows, who had been neglected, so that the apostles could give themselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word. The secret of the power of the Apostolic Church was that the new accessions "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." For a time the utmost harmony and the sweetest fellowship obtained. But soon, as we have seen, elements of discord from within and persecution from without imperiled the Church's peace and brought it into a manifest state of militancy, which emphasized the fact that it was in the midst of a wicked world in which its purity and holiness would be the result of constant sifting and severe testing. Imperfection therefore marked the Christian Church from the days of the apostles. As at the beginning with our first parents, the devil's lies and deception ever prevailed with some. There was a devil in the apostolic band; an Ananias and a Sapphira are found among the first fruits of Pentecost. The Church of Corinth was not only rent by divisions and imperiled by false doctrines, but it had to be purged from a form of adultery which threatened its very life. Of the Church in Sardis it was written "Thou hast a few names which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy."

The Bible records the faults and deficiencies as truly as the virtues and excellences of men and in this we have incidentally a mark of its genuineness and authenticity,—its real divinity. In the record of human biography we find, as a rule, a favorable bias, since a friend is the biographer. The virtues are magnified, and the failings are minimized, if not overlooked. But not so in the inspired records of Revelation. Here we find biography faithfully recorded, however man's imperfections are made to appear. A David's double sin of mur-

der and adultery, a foremost apostle's repeated denial of his Lord, no less than their deep repentance and reinstatement find a place in the sacred record. An unregenerate and consequently unsanctified ministry, as always, so now, is the bane of the Church. When we thus write we are not unmindful that the characters of those who minister in our pulpits and at our altars, do not nullify the efficacy of Word and Sacrament, but the profane and the unholy have always limited the best success of God's grace, as media or channels of its administration. There is a real sense in which it is true that the best part of every sermon, in its gracious effect, is the man behind it, and that those who minister at God's altar should have pure hearts and clean hands.

"The Church of Christ," as we understand it, and as a modern writer defines it, "is designed to be a community of regenerate and believing souls who have not only a definite relation to their Lord and to each other, but also a definite relation and responsibility towards them that are without." Effort in behalf of those within becomes a preparation and a condition for effort in behalf of those without. Many a Church is overfed, but under-exercised, and is therefore suffering from a double weakness under which a state of paralysis is invited, which produces utter helplessness in meeting one's obligation to God and one's responsibility to fellowmen.

MARKS.

The maintaining of the true relation of the objective and the subjective in thought, faith and practice, must ever be a great concern, if we would keep the right balance of things which have to do with the Church not merely as an external organization, but pre-eminently as the assembly of believers, the community of the saints, the brotherhood of the saved in Christ, just as care must be exercised to keep in right relation and fair equipoise the transcendent and the immanent in the Deity, so we must never allow an eccentric or a one-sided emphasis on the Church as an organization and the Church as an assembly of be-

lievers. Undue emphasis on the former conception of the Church gave us the dark ages; a restoration of the latter called for and made the Reformation a reality, whose necessity should never be beclouded in these days of too ready compromise of truth with error. In the summary of the Imperial reply to the confession of the five princes and six cities of the Diet held in Augsburg we find the following: "The seventh, of the Church, is rejected, where they mean to have it understood that only the congregation of the saints is the Church, for in the Church good and bad are congregated. But it is approved in that the Church abides forever." (The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church—Richard, p. 134).

The Church, the called forth and out, as the community of saints, must be insisted on, while the existence of the community of saints, contemplates a form of organization. Loyalty to Christ will create loyalty to the Church. If every member of the Church is in vital communion with Christ, will not such loyalty to Him produce loyalty to the Church? In vital union with Christ, the head, will create union of each member with the Church, Christ's body. A Christ without a body is not to be thought of and a headless body is a monstrosity. Head and body in right relation, there is a symmetrically vital organism, which becomes, or is, an assembly of believers, the community of saints. As in Christ, the Divine and the human are inseparably united, so in the Bible, in the Church, in the sacraments, and in the Christian life, and whenever we unduly exalt the one or the other, or attempt a separation, we do violence to what God has joined together.

The Lutheran Church insists on the medium of our salvation being the Means of Grace—the Word and the Sacraments, in such a way as has led some among us to look upon our beloved Church as only truly characterized, when it is denominated the Church of the Means of Grace, however always bearing in mind that this medium of salvation involves the agency of the Holy Spirit, who is in the Word, written and visible, and accompanies it making it efficient unto our salvation as means, where

there is no resistance, or where there is present an intelligent, heart-yielding, soul-committing faith. Some years ago, when creed-revision was much written about, there were those who tried to make the impression that the Augsburg Confession does not sufficiently accentuate the office and work of the Holy Spirit in the work of redemption. A careful analysis of the doctrinal articles gives abundant evidence of the recognition of the Holy Spirit's place in redeeming love both in its provision and its application. Where the pure truth of God is believed, confessed and taught there is the Holy Spirit. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Where there is such faith and confession there is the Holy Spirit, filling his office and doing his work.

Those who do not find the Holy Spirit in sufficient prominence in the Augsburg Confession fail to read and study it aright. Like justification by faith the Holy Spirit's presence and agency are implied, if not expressed, in every article. The Savior gives an important place and high honor to the Holy Spirit in the entire work of redeeming love. In creation and providence as in redemption He holds a manifest place. In the inauguration and establishment of the Christian Church, He is a most active agent. It were strange indeed if He should not appear very prominent in the Church's confessions. If it had fallen to my lot to help prepare young men for the Gospel ministry it would have enlisted my supreme efforts to have them rooted and grounded in a correct knowledge of the person of Christ, and a clear and thorough mastery of the epoch-making and church-reclaiming history of the Reformation. Incorrect, partial and eccentric views of the God-man our divine-human Savior, at once our prophet, priest and king, through deepest humiliation and highest exaltation, apart from whom there can be no approach to God, in the assurance of pardoning love and no realization of God-given grace unto salvation, through the applying ministry of the Holy Spirit in the truth by the appropriation of faith, are the peril of the hour in relation to redeeming love. Some of the cults,

now busy in sowing error, do not even mention the word grace, in their bold efforts at self-redemption. In the history of the Reformation, in clearest manner the Church of the centuries which had fallen on evil days, was reclaimed and brought back to the days of apostolic simplicity, and Pentecostal power, through divinely chosen agencies and instrumentalities, in thought, conception and teaching. Thoroughly to know the men and the history of the days of the Sixteenth Century with a clear comprehension of the principles in the maintenance of which they wrought and achieved is to be fitted for evangelical service anywhere. Where justifying faith is held as the victory which overcometh the world, at once the article of a standing or a falling Church, and where the Bible is yet accorded the supreme place of authority in matters of faith and practice, all other doctrines, history, and cultus will come into right relation to saving truth. In thus emphasizing the person of Christ and the evangelical history of the Reformation I would not be understood as discounting the history of the Church's earlier centuries. In the establishment and triumph of the true doctrine of the person of Christ, the theologians of the early centuries of Christianity did Trojan work. The mere mention of this fact is called for here, lest the prominence given to Reformation history in relation to the person of Christ might be misunderstood as minimizing the primal importance of this early work, when the evangelical doctrines were molded, formulated and defended, and made to triumph. The Reformation was the restoration and re-affirmation of these fundamental verities of our holy Christianity. There have been and are two leading conceptions of the Church: One that it is a mere organization. This is seen in its perfection in the Roman hierarchy, which leaves no room for an invisible Church. The other, that it is a communion of saints, involving a living, intimate relationship of all the members with Christ, the head, and with one another, in which not all who are enjoying outward relationship can be reckoned with as belonging to the true Church, which consists of all who, in the power of faith, have appropriated

Christ to their personal salvation, through word and sacrament as the appointed means of grace. Over emphasis of the Church as an organization will result in the baldest formalism. Too little emphasis of the Church as the communion of saints, whose members, not through mere culture and an attempted self-redemption, but through grace, are in communion with God in Christ through the truth, vitalized by the Holy Spirit, and with one another as a consequence, is the greatest peril of much of the Christianity of to-day. The need of the hour is the restoration of the Church, as in the days of the Reformation, to apostolic simplicity, evangelical purity and evangelistic power.

Religious truth is not acquired by any mere intellectual process, however good in itself; it is revealed not to philosophical wisdom or intellectual culture, or practical sagacity in affairs, but to child-like humility and docility, Zophar's question addressed to suffering Job: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" can never be answered by the unaided intellect. (Job 11:7). The kingdom of God must be received by us, as a little child. To all others entrance will be denied. (Luke 18:17). So eminent an authority as Paul writes, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called * * * . That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." (I Cor. 1:26-31). Christ Himself, after "upbraiding the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not," thanked his Father because He had hid these things from the wise and prudent and had revealed them unto babes, concluding his prayer of thanksgiving: "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." (Matt. 11:20-26).

Professional evangelism is not meeting with unqualified favor in the Churches which, in the past, have been relying upon revival methods for the increase of their membership. At the annual meeting of the United

Evangelical Conference, in Harrisburg, the latter part of February, it was pointed out that the professional evangelist can never take the place of the regular minister in bringing men and women into the Church. The traveling evangelist is a supplementary aid of importance in this work, but the real constructive work of building up the Church must be done by faithful and untiring ministers—men who not only seek the straying, but who do their utmost to keep the saved, the graciously influenced, within the fold as well. The Church which has been brought under the influence and winning power of an evangelistic campaign, so general now, must cultivate the grace of caring for the converts, the babes in Christ. A responsibility, at once calling for the Church's utmost endeavor, to train these in the fundamentals of the new life, should challenge the Church's supremest effort. It is one thing to bring those without to take a stand for Christ, and another to keep them true and faithful, in the service of it. As a preparation for communicant church membership, on the part of the baptized membership, we know no substitute for diligent catechisation, in order to an intelligent, heart-yielding and steadfast discipleship. The history of the Church has but one voice touching this method of making disciples. The rules and regulations of the Churches are much at one on the importance of early and persistent indoctrination, but many fall short in the practice. In so far as professional evangelism and modern revivalism tend toward the neglect of systematic instruction, in so far do these easy and popular methods of making disciples come into conflict with the highest and best interests of evangelical Christianity. The divine order, in effecting a cure for sin, is the head, the heart, the life. In that wonderful arraignment of God's ancient people, laying bare their rebellious perverseness on account of sin, in the first chapter of his evangelic prophecy, Isaiah declares, among other things, "the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and fresh stripes:

they have not been closed up, neither bound up, neither annointed with oil." (Isa. 1:5, 6).

We recall a conference of pastors on the state of the Church, at a conference meeting, in which there was a general exchange of experiences. Most of the pastors seemed somewhat discouraged, and in stressing the cause of the Church's indifference and their meagre success in building up their people in a real aggressive Christian life, the reason was located in the heart. It finally came the turn of the secretary to speak. He remarked upon the unanimity of the brethren in diagnosing the spiritual condition of their people as heart trouble. His people, he said, had a more serious affliction. It was trouble of the head. Some writers and public speakers have acquired the habit of using loose and misleading phraseology when writing and speaking of Scriptural narrative and history. It comes from the current way of speaking of that which is parabolic, poetic and illustrative in the Bible records. How common it is for men of the so-called newer thought to speak of the Old Testament narratives and the New Testament parables as stories. The story of the Sower, the story of the Prodigal Son, and recently the account of the defense of Stephen, so eminently historical, was placed under a heading the story of Stephen's defense: "The Lesson Story." The words "Inspiration," and "inspirational," as also "spiritual uplift," in public address and in public print, are used in a way which gives but little meaning to them in the connection in which they are used. Inspiration scripturally and theologically, has a distinct place and meaning. The prophets of the Old Testament and the evangelists and apostles of the New were inspired by the Holy Ghost, so that their word is the Word of God. Hence by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is meant that the writers of the Bible wrote as they were moved and guided by the Holy Spirit. Therefore to speak of a convention as educational and inspirational, of the playing of a High School orchestra as inspirational music, and of an ordinary service as having in it great spiritual uplift, is to say the least, using phraseology which is misleading, the fruit of

loose thinking and careless expression. The study of correct theology of the Augsburg Confession and careful indoctrination would suggest a saner phraseology and a more careful use of words, which are calculated to give expression to thought in harmony with the Scriptures and the best thought of the centuries. It is pathetic how ignorant the majority of our young people are of a knowledge of the Scriptures, of a systematic understanding of the plan of salvation, of clear definitions of grace, and repentance and faith, of the work of the Holy Spirit,—as operative in and through the truth, in effecting the divine call, spiritual illumination, regeneration, conversion, justification, union with God, and sanctification, of the conditions of salvation, which in their simplicity call for repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and which, by the attempted substitution of a form of work-righteousness for genuine repentance and justifying faith threatened to run the early church into the narrow groove of a Jewish sect, instead of standing for a unique religion which is designed for all the world. A beclouding of these simple yet fundamental things in the dominant Church of the Middle Ages, made the Reformation a necessity. And should we not allow the caution, growing out of false philosophies, and strange theologies and astounding cults and isms to-day, not to allow ourselves to be either swerved or lured from the time-tried, history-tested, and Scripture-enjoined foundations of the faith. For, “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” (Ps. 11:3). The inadequacy of the *personal* factor in the realization and accomplishment of the Church’s mission is imperiling its highest efficiency. “How shall they hear without a preacher and how shall they preach except they be sent.” For, at least, two score years, or more, the question of the paucity of ministers has been a matter of frequent and much discussion, various have been the causes assigned, and many the solutions suggested, but the fact remains. That more young men do not enter the Christian ministry has been laid at the door of parents, Sunday School teachers and pastors, and surely there is remissness here. The worldliness of

the age and the Church's alarming indifference, allowing herself to be drawn into an attitude of compromise with the evil that is in the world, may possibly be among the most potent reasons of the steady decline of candidates for the Gospel ministry. The attractive power and piety of our Seminaries will largely be what prayerless homes, Churches full of worldliness, and colleges, given over unduly to athletic activities, pleasures that fascinate, charm and blight the religious instinct, make them. There is fault all along the line from the home, in the Church and through the Christian college, to the pulpit. The ministry of to-day, in what it allows itself in all manner of amusements and all sorts of fascinating, worldly pleasures is so unlike that of former days that one is led to wonder whither we are drifting. Apart from professional evangelism, it is seldom one hears fearless rebuke of the bold and flagrant sins of the day. How unlike is such a ministry to that of the prophets, apostles, Christ himself, and the reformers of more recent days. The only Church which has a provision in its organic law, forbidding dancing, card-playing, and theatre-going, finds it difficult to keep its own ministry from rescinding it. In practice the law is constantly made void, which is given by some as a reason why it should be taken out of the organic law of the Church, yet this is the only Church which seems to have a surplus of ministers. One conference had to make a number of transfers, at its annual meeting in March, to find place and work for its ministerial membership willing to serve its constituency as active pastors. Whether this is due to its peculiar polity, or policy, or to its superior piety, which impels more of its young men to seek the ministry as a vocation, we could not undertake to decide. We do know that its polity or policy marks great hardships on the circumference of the system and opens the door for a form of political activity, which cannot be endorsed as sanctioned by the word of God, nor in harmony with the highest ministerial consecration. At the risk of being charged with advocating a Donatistic conception of the Church, and a Puritanic ministry we must say that the worldliness of

many of our homes, of our schools as well, and the consequent low type of piety which is sometimes found in our Seminaries, become a peril to the vital Christianity for which the Church must never fail to stand,

In order to form a proper conception of the Church, it must be remembered that since the ascension of Christ He carries forward the work of redemption from the throne and the greater works of which he spake to His disciples manifest themselves; that the executing agent is the Holy Spirit, the third person of the God-head, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and the Son; that the means which become the channels through which He works, is the truth, as expressed in word and sacrament, in which He was the inspiring energy and now is the convicting, quickening and life-imparting power; that the instrumentality is "the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood," (Acts 20:28) the pillar and ground of the truth, the assembly of believers, the community of the saints—sinners saved by grace, among whom the Word is faithfully preached and the sacraments are rightly administered, i. e., according to the Gospel. In this Church we find the preaching, the pastoral and administrative functions, emphasized in the exercise of which Christ would win this world to himself, as head of the Church, His Body,—the bride of Christ—through the ministry of reconciliation. To prepare such a ministry was his chief concern, in the accomplishment of his mission to earth. The hearer of the Gospel message in turn was to become an inviter, the thirsty and the willing becoming partakers of the water of life, whose streams issue forth from underneath the throne of God, freely, copiously, a gratuitous gift. There may be an organization, an ethical club, whose morality is too attenuated to seriously affect life and character, whose advocates make bold to aver that only five evangelical ministers out of a hundred who yet preach the Easter message, believe it, a sort of self-congratulation society that new truth has been discovered and that a new way of administering the same has been found, but a Church, which in its very life and fellowship is an assembly of believers, a community of

saints, these things can never become. Such an organization whatever claims it may put forth in name and professed achievement, however it may claim to bend and direct the will of heaven to its mind, desires and will, is wanting in an evangel, a gospel of life and love and hope, because it has no message of pardon and peace, and joy in believing. "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." The spirit makes effective His inviting ministry through word and sacrament and also through all for which the Church stands. The Church by some of our theologians, with its ministry as an agency of service, has been mentioned as a means of grace. Viewed in a general way little fault need be found with such conception of the Church so long as the real means of grace—the word and the sacraments—are given a primary place. The Word of God is Spirit-inspired and He uses it, when proclaimed by the faithful servant of God to call, to enlighten, to regenerate, to sanctify. This great truth makes Christianity a unique religion. A preached Gospel is distinctive of, and essential to, Christianity. To preach and to teach the truth, as revealed in Word and Sacrament, is primary in the Christian religion. Where readers and reading are substituted for preachers and preaching there can be no Church. There are cults and isms in the world to-day who lay claim to having found the only way to love and goodness, in whose system of thought and so-called religion, the word grace is nowhere used, nor is the need of it anywhere expressed. And is it any wonder, for sin in the Scriptural sense is nowhere acknowledged and the righteousness of faith, which is the heart's appropriation of sin's remedy, is but a synonym for self-salvation. In line with this, only from another angle is the Stoneman's Club movement, which stirred the religious circles of Philadelphia shortly after the "Billy" Sunday campaign closed. The organization of so-called interdenominational clubs by churches,—the moving one in the undertaking being a Church of the apostolic succession which, to say the least, suggests a purpose of proselytism, in which the holy sacraments are introduced in an abnormal way, to give the clubmen the standing of membership

in the Episcopal Church in a very broad way, cannot be endorsed. Such things as these cause the true Church to suffer the refinement of persecution. What will not some persons do to seek that which promises a kind of spiritual and social profit, with the emphasis on social, if they may be allowed to ignore a divine human Savior and His true Church. The multiplication of societies which use the Church, and yet do not fully identify themselves with it, is a most serious peril of the Church. This newest movement, if its purpose and aims have been correctly reported, is an easy way to get into a sort of fellowship with the Church, which will increase it numerically, but not in real power, for it will result in increasing the number of nominal adherents—unregenerate men—who do not rise above the conception of the Church as an external organization, whereas the true Church is an assembly of believers the communion of saints, created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works, having experienced, and living in repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Persons who identify themselves with an organization, which enjoys a quasi-sanction of the Church in so far as to receive baptism, when the first or initial degree is taken, the second degree calling for Christian allegiance, and Episcopal confirmation when the final degree is given, are hewing out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. (Jer. 2:13). For any human organization to assume the right to use the divinely ordained Sacraments to help its membership along the degrees to honor, is little short of sacrilege. The Lutheran principle that what is not plainly prohibited by the Word of God may be allowed, or, at least, tolerated, should be ever kept in mind. It would save us from mistakes in doctrine and practice. What is necessary God has enjoined in His Word; what He has not enjoined is not necessary. The plain layman can and should take this position. But this does not mean that the Christian may allow himself a license which a sane liberty cannot allow; nor does it mean that some things which are not especially taught in the Scriptures may be helpful in the work and worship of the Church. *Adiaphora*, that is, things

indifferent, which may be held without injury to Holy Scripture, as things neither commanded nor forbidden by the Divine Word, may be tolerated and received in the exercise of Christian freedom, but they are not to be imposed by authority, nor forced upon the Church by a hostile power, nor made a test of soundness in the Christian faith. The Fifteenth Article of our Confession guards the improper use of such rites and usages in the Church, when "instituted to merit grace and to make satisfaction for sins they are useless and contrary to the Gospel."

ATTRIBUTES.

The attributes of the Church which give expression to its true nature, are Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolity, Permanency and Indefectibility. The marks of the true Church determine in what its unity consists. It must be in the existence within a congregation of these marks. The pure doctrine of the Gospel is the only bond of union. It is not found in organization into any widely extended ecclesiastical government, so that all have either one visible head, or are subjected in their ecclesiastical relations to one set of rules. It is not in a common name, or any uniform order of church services. "To the true unity of the Church, it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments, nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites or ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike." Nothing that God has not enjoined, however useful for peculiar conditions of the Church's service or work, can be required as essential to the Church, or to its unity. "We are speaking of true, that is, spiritual unity, without which faith, that is, righteousness of heart before God, cannot exist in the heart. For this we say that the sameness of human rites, whether universal or particular, is unnecessary, because the righteousness of faith is not bound to certain traditions, as the righteousness of the law was bound to Mosaic ceremonies." (Apology). This does not touch the question as to the desirability of uniformity in ceremonies and other regulations, as a

pure matter of expediency for the sake of good order, in the human arrangements of the Church, on its external side. But even there, where the faith remains the same, the dissimilarity does not destroy their inner unity. "As differences in the length of days and nights do not injure the Church's unity, so we hold that the true unity of the Church is not injured by dissimilar rites instituted by men." (Apology).

"If the style of German dress is not worship necessary before God for righteousness, it follows that even those who do not use the German, but the French style, may be righteous and sons of God and the Church of Christ." (Apology). "No Church, on account of dissimilarity of ceremonies, of which some, according to their Christian liberty, use less, and others more, shall condemn another, provided they be harmonious in doctrine, and in all its parts, and in the lawful use of the Sacraments." (Formula of Concord, Part II, Art. X, 29). On the other hand, where the faith is diverse, no uniformity in external rites brings unity. The adoption of common adiaphora may conceal, but it cannot remove the diversities. The adoption of the Episcopal form of government cannot make Calvinists Arminians. Their common congregational government does not obliterate the difference between Unitarian and Trinitarian congregationalists. "The Word and doctrine should effect Christian unity or fellowship; where it is the same and alike, the rest will follow, but where it is not, there is no unity." (Luther Erl. ed. XIX: 248). "Ceremonies that are not contrary to the Scriptures may be tolerated as things indifferent, but when they are required as a mark of distinction, or as a necessary adjunct of the proper worship of God, or are imposed by authority, they are to be resisted as things contrary to the Gospel. Such was the position taken at the beginning of the Reformation." (The Conf. Hist. of the Luth. Church, p. 393.—Richard).

Touching "human traditions, rites or ceremonies instituted by men" we had an illustration of the inconsistent lengths to which persons and sects may go in lifting things indifferent into the domain of the essential. A

diminutive, well dressed elderly gentleman mounted a train, and occupied a seat immediately in front of us. It was on a Saturday evening. He wore a hat with a pronounced brim. A good crop of long gray hair and a full, white beard, of good length formed a contrast with the black hat. A frock overcoat, the usual buttons behind, wanting, which we expected, but what interested us immensely was that three neatly covered buttons adorned each sleeve of the neatly fitting coat. This man, plainly a clergyman, only remaining with us between stations, manifestly was going to meet an appointment of worship. What puzzled us was to know how he could justify the buttons on the sleeves, while he omitted them on the back, where they would have been both an ornament and a support to the coat. Might this be a case of tithing mint, anise and cummin, in the sphere of human adornment, while the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith are omitted? We need not go far to find an answer.

(2) The Church is characterized also as "holy" because in essence "the congregation of the saints." Its head, Christ, is holy; the means of grace through which the Church grows and is maintained are holy; and its members, by faith in Christ, are sanctified, or made "saints," thus constituting it a "communion of saints." This, as far as its membership is concerned, must be regarded a relative holiness. Absolute perfection in holiness cannot be predicated of the Church. It is sinful, full of faults and infirmities, and stained by many spots and blemishes. The teachings of the Scriptures, the entire history of the Church, as well as our individual consciousness teach us this. "For in many things we all stumble." (Jas. 3:2). "The new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, arises within us when we prayerfully strive to serve God, and faithfully use the means of grace to our constant advancement in holiness. These things are daily necessary. (1) Because the old Adam,—our corrupt nature,—is not destroyed at once, but remains with us to the end of life; and (2) Because the new man is not perfected at once, but grows gradu-

ally into the perfect likeness of Christ..” (Catechism). “Our baptism signifies that the old Adam in us should, by daily sorrow and repentance, be drowned and die, with all sins and evil lusts; and again a new man daily come forth and arise who shall live before God in righteousness and purity forever.” (Catechism). This is what Paul teaches concerning baptism, not the mode, but the effect (Rom. 6:1-3) when he writes: “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” As He died for our sins and rose again so should we die to sin, and live in Him.

(3). “It is marked as Catholic in the sense of universal, in order to designate, not any local or sectional fellowship, but the entire body of Christian believers of all lands and for all time, having Christ as its head and the one Gospel as its faith.” (Christian Theology, Vol II, p. 384.—Valentine). This is the sense in which the word Christian is used in the creed, and we think it is well, to avoid misunderstandings, to let it stand, especially since a denomination which stands sort of midway between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, in its zeal for this term as its official name has thereby imperiled its peace and harmony. This is one of the many good things we have inherited from the fatherland and we do well to retain “eine christliche kirche.” “The Church was first called “catholic” by Ignatius of Antioch (A. D. 110). He means thereby to describe it as the association embracing all believers, however widely scattered, or, in other words, the Church at large. Polycarp of Smyrna (A. D. 155) had the same conception of the word. But since at a later day the term was employed as a designation of the orthodox, external ecclesiastical communion, with a distinct and definite constitution, as is so often understood even in our day, Luther, in his German Catechism, substituted for it the word “Christian.” He thus reproduced the exact original meaning of the term, wher-

ever Christians are to be found, so far extends the Church.” (The Truth of the Apostles’ Creed.—Hay). “The temple is now wide as the world. For the Word is preached and the Sacraments administered everywhere; and wherever they are properly observed, whether it be in a ship on the sea, or in a house on land, there is God’s house, or the Church. Wherever, then, you hear or see such Word preached, believed, confessed, taught, practiced, have no doubt that there must be the holy Catholic Church, that is, a Christian holy people, even though they be few.” (Luther Erl.² 3:386). “The Creed says, Catholic Church,” in the sense of universal, “to prevent us from understanding the Church to be an outward government of certain nations, but rather men scattered throughout the whole world, who agree concerning the Gospel, and have the same Christ, the same Holy Spirit, and the same Sacraments, whether they have the same or unlike human traditions.” (Apology chapter IV).

(4). It is *apostolic*, as identical with that formed through the labors of the apostles, and as abiding in the Gospel as preached by them. This does not call for an identical form of ministerial succession or ecclesiastical government, as urged by high-church episcopacy, for which there is no proof in Scripture or in history. There is no proof that the order of apostles was perpetuated, or that “bishop” expresses a different order or higher rank than that of the elders of the Churches. The claim would class a special feature of the external form of the Church with its fundamental essentials of great saving truths of the redemptive Gospel and of spiritual union with Christ through them. Moreover, the testimony of experience is that there are true Churches of Christ which are not of that type of organization. The Nicene Symbol simply links the holy, universal Church in which we believe with that in which the apostles labored and taught. The irony of the situation among us to-day is that this form of church organization, with its closed pulpits and closed altars to all not of them, holding to the figments of an apostolical succession, and Episcopal confirmation and ordination, if these are to be valid, is

loudest and most insistent writing about, and talking the union of Christendom. The Churches of Christendom will never be able to unite on a form of organization, a claimed apostolic succession, the mode of a Sacrament, the method of conversion, or a broad liberalism which overlooks the distinction between truth and error, between the form of godliness and its power. The apostolic note of the Church which made the Reformation a necessity was the need of bringing the Church of the Sixteenth Century covered over with misleading traditions and the rubbish of work-righteousness, to a realization that she had left the simplicity and the purity of apostolic days. She needed to recover herself and re-establish in her heart and life the doctrines and faith of apostolic times. It is this which gives the Church of the Reformation its apostolic character; the material principle, justification by faith alone; the formal principle, or the supremacy of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the social principle, or the universal priesthood of believers, and that other vital principle to all true Protestantism as well as democracy, the right of private judgment.

The Church of the Middle Ages had largely lost this note of apostolicity, but Luther and his compeers brought the Church away from human traditions and a system of work-righteousness to the simplicity and power of the Gospel as disclosed in the Scriptures. The Protestant, not the Roman Catholic, is the apostolic Church. In these days, in some quarters we must witness Protestantism, in some of its imperfect forms, aping Romanism again. This is a sad situation, largely due to excessive form in religion, and astounding worldliness, since laxity in morals and laxity in doctrine, calling for undue formalism in worship as a rule, go hand in hand. A speaker at the National Layman's Missionary convention, in Harrisburg, dwelling upon the lack of missionaries in India said, "It would be easy to baptize hundreds of inquirers in various localities, but to do thus, when the men to care for them are not at hand would result in a baptized Chris-

tianity, which would be committing the mistake of the Middle Ages over again." A baptized Christianity, without previous or subsequent nurture in what Christian baptism signifies becomes a serious peril. There can be no substitute for persistent teaching in the things that make for righteousness. It is pleasant to note the many evidences that the Churches composing the various denominations are coming more and more to see the necessity of an instructed church membership. "The Herald and Presbyter," for example, thinks that "the minister who does not take time to indoctrinate his people need not be surprised if the fads of false doctrine break out and run wildly among his people. People need to be instructed in regard to the doctrines and duties of the Christian faith." (Luth. Church Work and Observer, p. 5, April 6, 1916).

Luther's view of the Church is that it is Christo-centric and that everything in the Church, as helps to the devotional order of the worship, may be retained. But the extremists among the Reformers sought to expel whatever is not directly commanded. What a contrast between now and thirty years ago in the matter of the observance of Holy Week and the accompanying Easter Services. This is called for and is well-timed by a gracious Providence, since there is no better way of maintaining the right balance between the objective and the subjective in our holy Christianity than by a judicious observance of the church year. The Church's festivals may be compared to the mountain peaks in the mountain ranges of Christian truth. By properly relating what comes between these, order and system and completeness may be maintained in the study, the presentation and the propagation of Gospel truth. As the coal fields of our country were discovered only after the supply of surface fuel was waning, so a gracious God directed His Church to the rich treasures of Gospel truth, from a christo-centric standpoint with new emphasis, when it was especially needed, because of the wicked attacks of rationalistic thinkers upon the supernatural in revelation and the absolute Deity of Christ.

(5). Our article, in disclosing the true nature of the Church also emphasizes its Permanency and Indefectibility. It declares that "one holy Christian Church shall continue to exist which is the congregation of believers in which the Gospel is rightly preached and the Sacraments administered according to the Word of God." This makes the Church in which Lutherans believe as broad as Christianity, as enduring as eternity and in no way subject to availing defect or decay. "Infinite are the dangers that we see threatening the destruction of the Church. Infinite is the multitude of the godless in the very Church, who oppress it. Lest, therefore, we should despair, and that we may know that the Church is, nevertheless, to remain, and that however numerous the godless, nevertheless, it exists, and Christ gives it what He has promised, viz., forgives sins, hears prayer, gives the Holy Spirit, this article has been framed." (Apology, chapter IV).

"In the same sense, the Church is said to be infallible. As an external organization, it is constantly liable to error, and fallible. But there will always be those who, while fallible shall not fail or fall. In every age there will be true children of God, witnessing the pure truth of the Gospel, even though they be greatly in the minority when compared with those who corrupt it. As Luther looked back over the past history of the Church, it was the recognition of this principle that made him so conservative. If the Church was to abide forever, and forever to testify to God's pure truth, it was incredible that the voices of witnesses could ever have been entirely suppressed; and, hence, he declared: "It is dangerous and terrible to hear or believe anything contrary to the unanimous testimony, faith and doctrines of the entire Holy Christian Church." (Erl. ed. 288a).

AUTHORITY.

In the study of God's Word, and the Confessions which grew out of the study of the Word, and are based upon it, the fact of the adaptation of these to all climes and times is one of the things which brings solid comfort to the

trusting heart. There has been a good deal said of the prophets as forth-tellers, no less than fore-tellers; of Jesus Christ Himself as being influenced by the times in which He lived, as well as being the prophet, priest and king of all times; of the evangelists and apostles, in the days of the Church's inspired history, as unduly controlled by what obtained in their day so as to disqualify them to speak for all the ages of time, but if we remember that the Word of God, as disclosed in the revelation of His will in the former and the latter dispensation is really and truly the Word of God then whatever be the changes within the domain of time and sense, there can never be wanting adaptation in the unchangeable Word of God. The things of time and sense must relate themselves to the will of God as expressed in his revealed and infallible Word, and the confessions of faith which are based upon this Word in matters of faith and practice. We have here a norm of faith and a basis of authority which become adequate for the world throughout all time. As Christ puts it: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Upon this truth, apprehended by the mind, confessed by the heart, quickened by the Holy Ghost, "I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "For through Him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye, (as Paul puts it) are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit." (Eph. 2:18-22). The Church is primarily a habitation of God; secondarily a home of God's children, and, for God and His children, a field where, as fellow-workers with God, the world is to be brought under dominion to Christ, in lines of battle and scope of conquest co-extensive with sin's curse. Christianity is more than a history, more than an argument, more than a theology,—it

is a spiritual revelation to the spiritual nature of man. On the part of man it is to be not an attitude, but a life—the very mystery of His spirit, too subtle for analysis, too strong for repression, too divine to be tolerant of corruption. The Word of God is two things, the revelation of God's plan of redemption, made known to lost humanity, and the means of grace, the medium selected by God through which the Holy Spirit operates in the hearts of men, creating and developing that faith and Christian life which condition genuine discipleship. Without a knowledge, experience and life of the first, there can be no genuine discipleship. Without the second, there is no medium and agency of true Christian knowledge, experience and life. Christ should never be exalted at the expense of His Church, the community of believers, to make possible which He gave His life. It is confusing things which are essentially related and interdependent. The authority of the Church has its source in Christ, the head, and is mediated, through preaching and teaching, the orderly administration of the Sacraments and Christian discipline as enjoined by Christ.

This authority which is spiritual and which must ever be distinguished from that which is wholly secular, expresses itself and executes the purpose of universal dominion in the faithful dissemination of the Word, careful pastoral oversight and the administration and the maintenance of Christian discipline. (Mat. 18:15-17). Christian discipline is so often irregularly administered. Instead of following the injunctions of the Savior in an orderly way, if one offends the first thought is excommunication, whereas this should be the last. Every means should first be employed to correct and restore. Excision is surely the last thing to be done, and only when the welfare and the life of the body demand it. A gangrened limb must be amputated, if the body is to be saved. The Church's authority along the line of Christian discipline is weak and is not exercised as it should be, either for the welfare of the individual under discipline, or the Church collectively. Sometimes the persons charged with the duty to administer the discipline are not in life and char-

acter, such as to produce in those disciplined a wholesome effect. There is need here for the earnest seeking and the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, as well as tact, patience and great prudence. The authority of the Church is great and commanding as its loyalty to its Head and to the revelation of God's will is complete. The domain of the Church's authority being that of the spiritual, becomes general only as it wins over to it the secular, and permeates it with its spirit thoroughly. The aim and promise of God, respecting His Church are universal dominion. The advancing hosts of God's children sing, and will continue to sing, adown the centuries,

Jesus shall reign wher'er the sun
Does his successive journeys run;
His kingdom stretch from shore to shore,
Till moons shall wax and wane no more.

To not a few well-meaning Christians the word "church" appears to be especially uncongenial. They prefer to speak of the kingdom of God. Some have even placed the two conceptions in direct contrast, regarding the kingdom of God as divine and the Church as human conception. But this conception stands in direct opposition to the reference of Jesus to "my church," and to all that He has said in regard to it. When we speak of the kingdom of God, or of Christ, we have most prominently in mind the King and His dealings with us; when we use the word church, we think of those who are united by their common faith in Christ and live in union with Him. "The kingdom of God comes when Jesus comes to men; the Church is built up when men believe in Him. This formal, but not real difference in the signification of the words makes it very evident why the Lord speaks, not of the kingdom, but of the Church, when designating the faith of men as its foundation. Hence everything in the discourses of Jesus which refers, not to the king, but to the subjects of the kingdom applies to the Church. Of this Church it is said that it springs from the seed of the Word of God; that it shall grow and become a great tree; that it shall diffuse its influence like leaven; that the eyes of the Lord detect the tares among the wheat, although

we may be unable to discriminate between the true and the false." (The Truth of the Apostles' Creed.—Hay).

The Apostle Paul, whose work was of such transcendent importance in the planting of the Lord's Church among men on earth, was also permitted to behold the state of those who are in heaven, in bliss. It was a wonderful and exalted privilege; it could not fail to be helpful, encouraging, comforting to this chosen vessel of the Lord. The man was obliged to deal with the problems and difficulties of the Church's life on earth, upon whom the burden of the "ecclesia pressa," the Church in its earthly tribulations bore so heavily, was brought face to face, with the realities of the unseen world where he obtained a view of the beautitude of the Church Triumphant in that glory to which he bore constant testimony in all his afflictions. No one can appreciate the value of this vision, unless he takes the exceptional work and trials of the apostle into account; if we add to this his character, we may be aided in obtaining a clue to his vision of Paradise.

The great revelations were intended for him alone, and, in his heart they were to be enshrined. Their utterance was reserved for heaven; on earth they were not to be repeated. Heaven's language, in all its fulness, may be spoken in heaven alone. From the vocabulary of a sin-stained earth they are withheld.

The goal of the Church is not reached in this world. The Holy Scriptures give many glimpses of its future glory in the world to come, where it will be free from the cross, and the pain and anxiety of battle. On this account the distinction is made between the Church Militant, warring in this life against the world, the flesh and the devil, and the Church Triumphant in Heaven, which John beheld in vision, being in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. "A great multitude which no man could number of all nations, and kindreds and people and tongues" having come out of great tribulation, having washed their robes and having made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

Camp Hill, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

ELEMENTS OF BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHY.

BY PROFESSOR LUTHER A. FOX, D.D., LL.D.

Bergson is one of the most conspicuous figures in the philosophic world. He is to-day in philosophic circles what Ritschl was a half century ago among the theologians, and their careers are likely to be very much alike. The eulogistic estimate of William James, the eminent psychologist, gave him a wide introduction in England and America to all who are interested in philosophic subjects. His philosophy has become a fashion which some people, who want to be in the foremost line of modern thought, affect. He has been the subject of numerous articles in the magazines. No writer dealing with the more recent tendencies in philosophy dares to ignore him. His philosophy is many-sided, and some who find much of their own philosophic creed in it, profess it without really understanding it. If we want to keep in touch with modern tendencies in their deeper spheres of thought it is necessary for us to become acquainted with it. To be able to understand any philosophy we must master its elements. The failure to do this has led some quite far astray who have attempted to write about that of Bergson. It is the purpose of this paper to deal only with its fundamental principles.

Monsieur Henri Bergson is a professor at the College of France. He has written a number of books, but the most important are "Time and Free-will," 1888; "Matter and Memory," 1896; and "Creative Evolution," 1907. The principles of his philosophy are found chiefly in the first. The other two are largely an unfolding and an application of these principles to the facts of the world. The "Creative Evolution" is the best known and is perhaps the greatest. The claim is made for him that he is not only an original and clear thinker, but also a very lucid writer. Originality of thought and clearness of ex-

pression do not often go together. A writer must use such language as is furnished him by his age. He must take words that have already a definite meaning and adapt them to the new thought. He gives them a new meaning which can be learned only from their various connections. This leads to confusion and ambiguity. We may get out of them an interpretation which the writer never intended. Was it not eminently true of Hegel, whose pupils broke up into three wings each claiming to be the true interpreters of the Hegelian philosophy? Was it not true in large measure of Kant, and of Ritschl? It is true certainly of Bergson. Many of his statements are vague. Able philosophers in interpreting him are compelled to say, "He seems to mean." We agree with many of his conclusions, as in regard to free will, when we dissent wholly from his premises. The treatment of some subjects seems to be that with which we are familiar while the fundamental ideas upon which it rests we are not yet by any means willing to accept. We are not in a position to estimate it until we get a clear idea of what we may call the alphabet of his philosophy. Until we know what he means by life, time, movement, matter, spirit, mind, body, intuition, intellect, free will, and some other terms we are wandering around in the dark while we are reading his works. As an example of how easily we may be led astray take his statement about God. He says, "God is a free creating God, producing matter and life at once, whose creative effort is continued in a vital direction by the creation of species and the construction of human personalities." That has on its surface the ring of theism, and yet his God is a very different sort of thing from our Father who is in heaven. For Bergson there is no purpose in nature, nothing but a vague indefinite movement so little conscious of its activities as to seem to us to be really unconscious. The idea is far more pantheistic than theistic notwithstanding the words "a free creating God."

Bergson calls his philosophy *The Philosophy of Change*. The name reminds us of Heraclitus, a Greek philosopher who lived about 500 B. C., and is popularly

known as the Weeping Philosopher. The philosophers of that day were puzzled over the problem of identity in the midst of constant change. There must be something changing or there can be no change. But if it is always changing how can it be the same? Heraclitus solved it by saying that the universe is an eternal *becoming*. This constant change is a fact, a reality, and Heraclitus thought that it is the only reality. This universal quality or state was taken as the most fundamental element. But still he could not entirely eliminate the idea that something must be or there would be no sphere for change. He posited fire in the form of flame that exists only by continually changing. "The universe is a closed circuit in which the ascending and descending currents counterbalance each other. It is this opposition of motions and the measured balance between them which produces the delusive appearance." This is the interpretation of Rogers of the Heraclitan philosophy and it applies equally well to that of Bergson. "The inner fire in us responds," Heraclitus said, "to the outer fire which is the reality of the world, and that is knowledge." Here is a very striking similarity to what we read in Bergson. This new philosophy of movement, of an eternal becoming, is not the original thing in Bergson. Life is another of the realities in Bergson's philosophy. Thales, a still older philosopher than Heraclitus, posited water as the primal element but it was somehow identified with life. The earth was like a plant that grew into existence. Life was endowed with the principle of motion, everything that moved is living. The magnet had life. Life is also one of the prime principles in the philosophy of Bergson. Instead of this philosophy, being so original, as is claimed for it, we find that in some respects it is a relapse into the philosophy in vogue among the Greeks about twenty-five hundred years ago. We may find so many points in common with Idealism, Pantheism, Scepticism and other systems of philosophy that the philosophy of Bergson seems like a new eclecticism. Yet we do not deny that Bergson has claims to originality.

Life is such a conspicuous principle in his philosophy

that it has been justly called Vitalism. It sometimes seems to be the most fundamental, the essential element. What is Bergson's idea of life? We will let him answer in his own words or in those of his approved interpreters. He says, "Reality is life." "Life is not a thing nor the state of a thing." "It is an unceasing becoming which preserves the past and creates the future." "To exist is to be alive, to be borne along in a living stream. The actual present now in which all existence is gathered up is this movement accomplishing itself." "Life is an indivisible movement." "The bond which holds the universe together is not intellectual but vital." "There is life not only in rational animals and vegetable beings but also in everything that moves, and as nothing is immovable everything that exists is some form of life." "Vegetation, instinctive and rational life are not different degrees but divergent directions of the vital activity that split up as it developed." Life and time are so closely related that they seem to be identical. "When we consider a living being we find that time is the very essence of its life, the whole meaning of its reality." "Our life is true duration. It is absolute, a flowing that never ceases, never repeats itself, an always present change becoming now." "Life is a spiritual activity, a conscious creative effort, leading towards freedom." "It is an original impulse intensifying in proportion to its advance." Life is God. "If we would call that ultimate reality, the universal principle underlying worlds and systems of worlds God, then we must say that God is unceasing life, action, freedom." Bergson thinks that "the task of philosophy is to comprehend life." "The true conception of life is the key to the nature of knowledge." Yet his philosophy is not a theory of life, and lacking a clear theory about his fundamental principle his philosophy is not a system but a bundle of philosophical speculations. After we have gathered together his statements about life and movement and time we still ask what does Bergson mean by it? It is a reality, but is it an entity, a force; a mere abstract movement, or a movement of time? We may think it undefinable because it is an original intuition.

But a life that belongs to no being is as vague as Hegel's thought without thinkers, or as James' consciousness without any self that is conscious.

Another fundamental element in Bergson's philosophy is Time. It is little less important than life. "Time is said to be the very essence of life." "When we consider a living being we find that time is the very essence of its life, the whole meaning of its reality." "Our life as actual experience, as the inmost reality of which we are most sure, which we know as it exists, is time itself." "Our life is true duration. It is a true form that is not measured by some standard. It is absolute." "When we concentrate our attention on our innermost experience, we perceive the reality of our life as a pure duration." These expressions imply the very closest relation between time and life, if they do not, as they appear on their face to do, regard them as identical. Time is said to be very closely connected with things. Science is so far in fault as it does not take account of this fact. "Time, as science conceives it, does not form part of the reality of material things." "Time is made of existence." The reality that is behind all appearances is time. "Time is real, the stuff of which things are made." "The principle, then, of this philosophy is that reality is time, that it can be expressed only in the terms of time, that there is no stuff more resistant, nor more substantial than time, that it is the very stuff of which life and consciousness are made." "What, for philosophy which perceives that time is reality, the stuff out of which matter is formed, is matter?" For Bergson, then, time is the stuff not only of which matter is formed, but also the stuff of life and consciousness. What does he mean by "stuff"? He does not tell us. We must understand it as the underlying reality of which life and things are composed. We have been told that life is the reality, that duration is life, and now must we believe that life is the material reality of which itself is formed? The subject becomes still more complicated when we are told that "space is not one reality and time another. It is one identical reality that we know by intuition in life." "The intuition of re-

ality that we have in the consciousness of our own life is not the apprehension of a kind altogether different from that other reality which we know when we perceive external things." This identification of space and time is the solvent for the problem of Materialism and Idealism. It is carrying the question back into Vitalism, but it leaves us puzzled about the relation of time, life, and space. He makes a distinction between real and unreal time, and between time and duration. Unreal time is measured by the change of material objects. Duration is what we call time without contents. In the movement of life we get a glimpse of pure duration.

As we read his discussion of time it is very evident that Bergson's conception of time differs very decidedly from that of the great body of men, not merely of the masses but even of philosophers. Time is certainly a reality. It differs from everything else so much that it can be conceived through nothing else. It cannot be defined. As space is the condition of extended objects, time is the condition of activity either material or spiritual. Before anything can begin to be there must previously be time. We must think of it as eternal, because we cannot think of an absolutely first moment, a moment without a preceding moment. Space is infinite and eternal in extension, and time is infinite and eternal in what has been called protension. Time is simple and indivisible. It is not made up of moments. The divisions we make are for the convenience of thought. Minutes, hours, days, years, centuries, milleniums mark the changes that take place in activities, but not divisions in time itself. Time is not active. It does nothing. It is only the opportunity for the action of causes. One grows old, not because time does anything, but because the forces at work in the body make the changes we observe in it. The three hundred or six hundred millions of years of the world's existence would have left the world a chaos, a mass without form and void, but for the agencies at work in it by which it was developed into what we now find it. It is only by figure of speech that we attribute the changes to time yet we sometimes deceive ourselves by this figure as we do

with many others. But the truth that time itself does nothing is so near the surface that no one can fail to see it as soon as the attention is directed to it. It is very difficult for us to see what Bergson means when he speaks of the movements of time as a great cause, and especially when he says that duration is life and that time is the stuff of which things are formed. We do not understand him when he speaks of time flying ten times or a hundred or a thousand times faster than it does. We can not conceive of it, but even if it could go twice as fast we do not know what difference it would make if the causes at work remained precisely the same. He thinks we attribute special qualities to time because we speak of the *length* of time, but he himself, as we do, uses special terms as symbols. It is very clear that his idea of time is very different from ours. And the vagueness of this fundamental principle makes the whole system indefinite. Failing to endorse that we must reject the whole. His idea of time is used in his argument for the freedom of the will as the power of self-determination. We hold also to that doctrine, but for very different reasons than he gives, and this is true of a good many other things that he says.

The third fundamental principle in this philosophy is Movement. These three constitute the Bergson trinity. By these the universe has been created. They are the ultimates behind which it is impossible to go. Movement is elementary. "It is movement that we must accustom ourselves to look upon as simplest and clearest—immobility being only the extreme limit of the slowing down of movement, a limit reached only in thought and never realized in nature." "Reality is a flow. This does not mean that every thing moves, changes and becomes; science and common experience tells us that it means that *movement, change, becoming is everything that is and that there is nothing else.*" "There are no things that move and change and become; everything is movement, is change, is becoming." "You have not grasped the central idea of this philosophy, you have not perceived true duration, you have not got the true idea of change and becoming until *you perceive duration, change, movement,*

becoming to be reality, the whole and only reality." "What then is the reality we perceive? The reality is movement." "If the intellect were intended for pure theorizing, it would take its place within movement, for *movement is reality itself*, and immobility is always only apparent or relative." "*Activity is the universal substance*. Strictly speaking there are no things, *there are only actions*." "Matter is the relation of our movements to other movements." The atom is only a movement. "If the movement ceases the atom no longer exists, there is nothing left."

Movement, like life and time is a reality. All qualities like color and temperature, are realities, but they are not the reality of things to which they belong. Illusions and dreams and hallucinations are realities, but they are not entities. All qualities are activities, but there is some deeper reality behind them. A color is a mere abstraction when there is nothing colored. A dream is nothing at all when there is no dreamer. So movement is only an abstraction, a thought about movement in general when there is not somewhere some sort of being in motion. Movement is a mode of being. It is not in itself an independent entity. It is not ultimate reality. Light is a reality. It is a kind of movement but there is always a source of light, a something in a process of change that starts a movement in the ether. Light is a fact but when God said "Let light be," He did not create any new independent essence. When movement began there was some reality behind it. Life is active but it is not the mere sum of activities. The universe as it manifests itself to us may be movements and counter movements but there is some kind of being, spiritual, or vital or material, that is the source and ground of it. It may be unsophisticated thought that demands it, but no kind of thinking can get away from it. The philosopher when he is not theorizing is as much bound by it as the common peasant. They may differ as to the nature of the being but not as to the fact of being itself. Both believe that movement is a reality but neither that it is the reality. When Bergson says that "movement, becoming is every-

thing that is and there is nothing else," and that "activities are the universal substance" "and that there are only actions" he contradicts one of the fundamental principles of reason. What is Bergson's answer to the question, What is the ultimate reality? Sometimes he seems to say that it is time. At other times it appears to be movement. At still others, life. Some of his interpreters say that life is the ultimate ground of force, the original impetus. But is it an entity, or a sum of activities? Is it a mode of the ultimate being or the eternal essence? If it be a mere shifting principle—movement or life or time—we have nothing but a mere abstraction as the ground of all things. Such a philosophy is as baseless as a dream. Bergson leaves us in complete uncertainty as to the relation to each other of these primal principles.

Bergson has much to say about matter and material things. He talks about our bodies and brain and nerves, about the sun and objects existing in space. He is well acquainted with modern science and tells us a great many interesting and valuable scientific facts. Creative Evolution is well worth reading for the scientific information one gets from it. It has justly been called a great work. But what is his doctrine of matter? What is our body? What are the objects with which science deals, the things we encounter in our daily life, the things we call material things? He tells us that "matter is a relation of movement." "Inert matter filling space, space that underlies matter as pure immobility, does not exist. Movement exists, immobility does not." Matter is the inverse of life. "Matter, extension in space, is the interruption which is an inversion of the movement which in life is a pure duration of time." The interruption in whatever way brought about is a "detension." He compares it to steam escaping into the air and being condensed into drops of water. Life escaping from the stream becomes matter. It is, however, "purely an appearance composed of the relation of one movement to other movements." "Our body is the exact actual present point at which one action is taking place, the point at which perception marks out our possible actions

and memory brings the might, as it were, of the past to push us into the future. *At every moment it may be said to perish and to be born.* The body is our instrument of action, it is the sharp edge of a knife which cuts into the future. It is the moving point pressing forward, the present moment in which consciousness makes that instantaneous section across the universe of becoming, which *takes for us the form of solid matter* spread out in space." "Our body is at the actual point where the present advancing into the future is becoming the past and at this point perception makes a cut across the universal flow. This present reality is matter. *Matter is the section which we imagine to exist simultaneously at every moment of actual perception,* and as this center of perception moves forward the whole section seems to move with it. Space is the way in which we represent it." Matter, then, is the contact of an advancing current with a resisting current, and our body is the product of the present conflicting with the future. The entire material world is the product of movement in vital currents.

This reads very much like absolute idealism. Matter is a section which we imagine to exist. It is a form of becoming which takes for us the appearance of solid substance. A body that is being constantly created and is as constantly perishing does not seem to be the body which each one of us inhabits. It seems more like a phantom than a real body. We do not quite understand just how it maintains its identity. If it is my life pushing into the future how does it become an abiding reality to so many other people? If the life still presses us into the future at what we call death what is the body that the friends bury? A thousand questions come pressing on us clamoring for an answer but we are so confused by their movements and counter movements, being created and perishing, we can find no satisfactory reply. The opposite of matter is spirit. What is Bergson's idea of spirit? "It is the process, the evolution, the prolonging of the past into the present. It is a pure time existence." "It is the memory which holds the past and unites it with the present in the living reality." "Pure memory affirms

the existence of mind or spirit, an existence that cannot be reduced to or explained by matter." "Perception affirms the reality of matter; memory the reality of spirit." "It is the intersection of mind and matter." "When we pass from pure perception to memory we definitely abandon matter for spirit." When the past which has ceased to exist as actual facts is brought up by memory into the present we become cognizant of the fact of the existence of spirit. Spirit reveals itself through memory, one of the functions of mind. This is Bergson's formal explanation of spirit. It is rather an account of how we recognize it than what it is. It is not complete. He uses the words spirit and spirituality in a still wider sense. There is spirit in unconscious psychical states. It is coextensive with progress. The only thing that has a pure time existence is life, and as spirit has pure time existence it is coextensive with life. It is not confined to rational and instinctive life; it extends even to vegetative forms of existence. His vague definitions shows that his idea of spirit is very different from that which is most widely current.

The philosophy of Bergson has a psychological basis. The first of his works was a study of the data of consciousness. His first and great discovery, as he thought, was to find the supreme significance of life. That is the most fundamental of the pure primary intuitions. To be able to understand him we must get the principles of his psychology. Every psychology must start with consciousness. We can never know any thing until it gets somehow into consciousness. If there are subliminal activities they must be forever unknown to us if they do not send some kind of message into consciousness. We can not begin to reason about anything until we get the facts as they appear in consciousness. Bergson says, "Consciousness is coextensive with universal life. To show the genesis of consciousness we must set out from this general consciousness which embraces it." "Consciousness is identical with life." If consciousness is coextensive with life and matter is only the condensed form of life that took a wrong direction, the true philosophy is

panpsychism. That form of consciousness which we call mind is a special mode of the universal life. Life becoming conscious of itself is the primary intuition. It is at this point mind is identified with pure duration. Life knows itself and for the moment is absorbed in the vision. It is the very first activity of mind. For psychology this is ultimate. This seems for Bergson the only pure intuition. This function of the mind of knowing itself as life occupies the entire field of what was known among the older psychologists as pure reason and among the Greeks as the nous.

In the psychical sphere Bergson finds three functions of life: instinct, intuition and intellect. Instinct is "the guiding principle of activity in the animals." It acts "by a natural disposition, without reflection, without interposing the perception of the relations or meaning of the actions, without the presentation to the mind of an end to be attained." It is unreflective pragmatism. "It differs from intellect only in the fact that it is unconscious." But he uses here the word consciousness in a sense as much too narrow as his general sense is too broad. He means only that the animal is unconscious of a purpose. "Instinct is somewhat like intuition." "Instinct is akin to that direct insight that we have called intuition." "Intuition is that sympathetic attitude to the reality without us that makes us seem to enter into it, to be one with it, to live it." By intuition "life is directly known." "The intuition of life is knowledge of reality itself, reality as it is in itself." Life in instinct has not attained a distinct consciousness of itself. It is not yet sufficiently evolved to note its progress. It is mind only in its lower stage of evolution.

Intellect is like instinct in the fact that it is in its nature purposive activity. It is different from instinct in that it is conscious of its ends. "It is a special adaptation of the mind which enables the being endowed with it to view the reality outside it but which at the same time limits both the extent and the view the mind takes of it." It has been formed by a narrowing, a shrinking, a condensation of general consciousness. "It cuts out in the

flow the lines along which our activity moves. It traces the lines of our interest." "It gives us knowledge for the sake of action." It originated in the practical demands of life and considered in its original feature it is "the faculty of manufacturing artificial objects, especially tools to make tools and of indefinitely varying the manufacture." It can never know the whole of life for "created by life in definite circumstances, to act on definite things, how can it embrace life of which it is only an emanation or an aspect? Deposited by the evolutionary movement in the course of its way, how can it be applied to the evolutionary movement itself?" It cannot grasp reality "because it divides and separates reality, thus replacing its concrete fulness with abstracted and partial aspects, and is doomed to failure however far its activities may be carried." It may be scientific but it can never be philosophic. "Our intellect is the faculty of knowing matter in the form of extension in space. Science is the work of intellect." "It discovers the relations and order of solid things." "It shows us knowing as a means, not an end; it is for the sake of acting." It is the faculty of interest. It is a guide to that which works. This is pragmatism.

By intellect he does not mean the whole of the cognitive powers, as the old psychologists did, but the function of reasoning. And this reason is limited to the facts of perception. It is a practical abandonment of philosophy. It is philosophical scepticism. He does not have a system of philosophy and he can never have one unless he extends the range of intellect. He says that if we accept his philosophy "it is not because we have weighed its arguments as a set of abstract principles but because we have entered into sympathy with it." We accept it not because of its harmony and consistency with itself, nor because its principles are clear deductions from the primary data of pure reason, but because it appeals to our feelings or our old way of thinking about things. He takes refuge in mysticism. "The more we succeed in making ourselves conscious of our progress in pure duration, the more we feel the different parts of our be-

ing entering into each other and our whole personality concentrates itself on a point." This is a disappearance of cognition in an experience of not anything at all. It is like Plotinus and Schelling having an immediate super-conscious intuition of God. Bergson proposes as the ultimate end of his philosophy the absorption of self in empty time. Is it not akin to Buddhism and its Nirvana?

Bergson makes some strong statements about our personality and self, and one of the chief glories of his philosophy, as he claims, is the clear and firm establishment of freedom. The principles of his philosophy are not promising, but we turn eagerly to the grounds upon which he bases his claims. He says, "Now philosophy will know this only when it recovers possession of the self by the self." "There is one reality, at least, which we all seize from within, by intuition and not by simple analysis. It is our own personality in its flowing through time—our self which endures." This knowledge of self is an immediate intuition. The intellect fails when it tries "to reconstruct personality with physical states, whether it confines itself to those states alone or whether it adds a kind of thread for the purpose of joining the states together." Upon this intuition of a personal self he plants his doctrine of freedom. "We are free when our acts spring from our whole personality, when they express that personality." "Free will is the expansion of the individuality of life. Our actions, even our free actions follow from and depend upon our character, and our character is formed by circumstances, but it is not external to us, it is ourself." All this is substantially true but there is nothing new in it. It is not the peculiar product of Bergson's philosophy. Indeed, when we look at his definition of self and personality it seems to be an exotic in his system.

What does Bergson mean by self? He thinks that the self is some kind of a modification of the great stream of becoming, a product of the ultimate reality whether time or movement or life. We will give his own statement: "On flows the current, running through human generations, subdividing itself into individuals. This subdivision is

vaguely indicated in it, but *could not have been made clear without matter*. Thus souls are continually being created which nevertheless in a certain sense pre-existed." Souls are "little rills into which the great river of life divides itself flowing through the body of humanity." Self, thus is a part of the great stream of life and is identified with it. It exists first only as a possibility and in that sense pre-exists. In some way it diverges from the main stream and as a jet it encounters a counter movement of some part of the stream that had primarily escaped and had become condensed into matter. In this conflict both self and body converge together. It was not a self until it found a body, and there was not a body until it met a self. The two were created together. The body we are told is constantly being created and annihilated. This must be true also of the self for it has no individuality, really no existence without a body. The body in this constant shifting between being created and destroyed looks very much like a phantom, and so does this self. It is impossible to understand how it maintains its individual identity. The self becomes spirit through memory, but how can there be memory without self identity. The chain of individuality is being constantly broken, and how can these momentary links bring up the past into the present? Bergson's self is something quite different from the self with which we are acquainted. The self is an original fact of consciousness. It is the most fundamental and universal of all judgments. "I am" is involved in all experience. Self is not the sum of mental activities but is the being that is acting. Hume said he could not catch himself without a thought or a feeling or a volition. Nobody else can. But in that very feeling or thought or volition he finds himself. The consciousness of self is a part of every fact of consciousness. It is the abiding self that links these activities of experience into a coherent whole. Any philosophy that does not include this fact is fundamentally, radically wrong. However bound by relations to other individuals and things self maintains the certainty of its own individuality and its own personality. This is so inwrought into our convic-

tions that though it may be for a little while beclouded it can never be eradicated. As soon as we see clearly what sort of self Bergson is dealing with we begin to be afraid of his fine sayings about free will and when we turn back to examine his definitions we find that our fears are well founded. "Free will, this power of free creative action, is *not the liberty of choice*, that indeterminists have asserted and determinists have denied. It is not the feeling of liberty that we have when we are set face to face with alternate courses from which to choose, nor is it the feeling we have when our choice has been made and we look back on the action accomplished, the feeling that we need not have acted as we did and could have acted differently." "But as this philosophy holds there is that in the nature of life and consciousness which is itself essentially free will." What that thing in life is that makes it essentially free "is becoming in which there is no repetition, in which therefore prediction is impossible." "Life in its entirety appears as an immense wave, which starting from a center, spreads outwards, and which on almost the whole of its circumference is stopped and converted into oscillation; at one single point the obstacle has been forced, the impulsion has been passed freely. It is this freedom that the human form registers." The original impetus brings forward an impulse that carries us over obstacles in ways that can not be predicted, and that is the self-determination which he calls free will. It seems to us very much like the most rigid determinism. Where there can be no choice to talk of liberty and free will seems absurd.

In the light of these elements of his philosophy we must interpret his definition of life. "Life is conscious spiritual activity creative effort leading towards freedom." It means something quite different from what we thought it meant when we first read it. The same thing is true of his definition of God: "God is a free creating God producing matter and life at once, whose creative activity is continued in a vital direction by the creation of species and the construction of human personalities." He does not after all mean a personal God but the ultimate reality,

whatever it may be, that lies behind this everlasting change. "If we would call that ultimate reality, the universal principle underlying worlds and systems of worlds, God, then we must say that God is unceasing life, freedom, action. And creation is a simple process, an action that is making itself across an action that is unmaking itself, like the fiery path of a rocket through the black cinders of spent rockets that are falling." This ultimate reality is not governed by a purpose. "These modes of the vital activity are not things that life has produced for their own sake, nor the final realization of a purpose. They are not things, nor ends but tendencies." "Does the evolution reveal to us the purpose and destiny of humanity? Only so far as this, it shows us that in one *very special sense* we are the end and purpose of evolution. Not that we existed beforehand as its purpose or final cause, *for there is no pre-existent plan*; the impetus lies behind us, not before. Not that we are the successful outcome of the impetus, the end of its striving, for we are the result of one divergent tendency and doubtless many accidents have helped to make us what we are." The ultimate reality did not intend to make us but in the incessant change it happened to produce us, but for no special end. We are part of that stream of life, a divergent rill, and all things are also parts of it. Here is pantheism as pure as that taught by Spinoza. It makes little difference that Spinoza called it substance and Bergson called it life. It gives us neither God nor immortality. It does not give us high moral ideals nor hold up any sure hope for the individuals. It leaves us in the open universe, the mere sports of aimless change.

A more dreary philosophy has never been proposed to the world.

Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

ARTICLE III.

CHURCH HISTORY THROUGH CHURCH STATISTICS.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D., D.D.

The Lutheran Church for the most part has been over shy of figures. Frightened at the results of David's census it has been past learning the New Testament's "what man of you having to build sitteth not down first and counteth the cost." With its magnificent and never-to-be-changed emphasis upon the things that are inner and essentially unseen, the Lutheran Church has perhaps failed to remember all the steps of the truly conquering Church, which in the very throes of its Pentecostal power had its 3000 and later its 5000, and registered them. "The Lord shall count when He writeth up the people, that this man was born there" (Psalm 87:6) shows a salutary statesmanship of numbers even in the ancient days.

When now, because of Lutheran indifference to figures and also negligence upon the part of those whose proper and bounden duty it is to furnish the facts, our Church is represented to the world in the current census figures for 1915 as having lost 10,000 communicants, we have foregone all right of complaint. But the situation ought to set us thinking as to our duty in the premises. It will not suffice to say, as has recently been said, (J. F. Ohl, Literary Digest, Mar. 27, 1915), "Dr. Carroll does not seem to understand that the Lutheran Church makes little of organization but much of faith." This leaves us resourceless in the presence of a great wrong. The fact is that organization is no longer disregarded in the Lutheran Church in this country, while in Europe it has long since had the most painstaking and accurate attention paid to it. Faith and organization. We have long time now ceased to put James over against Paul. This we must do and not leave the other undone.

It may hearten us that Dr. Carroll finds, in a 25-year cross section of American church growth, that the Lutheran Church leads the Synodical Conference having a gain of 130 per cent., the General Synod coming next with 116 per cent., while the revivalistic communions, as the Methodist Episcopal and Baptist North register 63 per cent. and 56 per cent. respectively. Yet really we cannot lay our hands on the underlying elements which have definitely gone to make this increase, because we have not appreciated the worth of keeping the rolls of the churches undivided. In short, we do not as a Church recognize figure values, save as ground of an occasional boast. But figures are rather to the end that we may see our weaknesses and locate them, than that we may merely hibernate in a sort of flaccid strength.

The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table said of figures that the way to make them interesting was "not to talk them, but to talk about them." Talked about they lead to wholesome diagnosis. Take any church factor—the problem of church divisions, of church propaganda, of missionary, liturgical, or even devotional progress,—the answer cannot be adequately given without a careful view of the figures to compare, to summarize amounts, to relate with the past, to register publications and distributions, and to collate the results in whole or in part.

It is in trying to make figures do the impossible that disaster overtakes us. Therefore the need for the Lutheran Church in this country to give a larger and more definite attention to this matter and this right soon.

No one claims that the method of statistical observation is of universal application. Yet the whole of our "social science is found not only in qualitative distinctions but also in quantitative measurements." (Mayo-Smith-Statistics-Sociology, p. 8). And "the grand office of statistics," according to the above authority, Dr. Mayo-Smith, "is to direct our attention to possible relations of cause and effect which might otherwise have escaped our notice." This is of signal value to the present-day Church in all its many activities and its world-wide application of Grace.

Can we not know better how to achieve the high calling of the Church in Jesus Christ? No doubt the answer is "Yes." And when this is done, if it ever is done, tables of faithfully prepared statistics will have played a not unheroic part. To this end we need, like the Church of Germany, less of the figurative and more of the figures.

The Evangelical Church in Germany maintains its organization with a really marvellous analysis of its life on all possible sides. Some of these facts and processes as the figures tell them may help us both by showing the method of statistics and by giving us some factors of real importance in their life as a Church.

First, naturally, birth figures. In the German Reich there were born in 1900 2,060,000, or 36.77 souls to a thousand of population. In 1913 the births numbered 1,894,598, or 28.29 persons to a thousand. This is a decrease of 8 births in a thousand, and has given rise to much political discussion and anxiety on the part of the Church. But according to a universal statistical law, it is believed that after the war there will be again an increase of the birth rate. The absolute excess of births over deaths in Germany in 1912, was 839,954, and indeed for a period of ten years it has been a little more than this, or 848,000.

The authorities are inclined to believe that the diminution in birth rate is owing to indolence and love of ease and pleasure. Prof. Seeberg at the Church Social Congress in Bremen in 1913 lectured on this to-the-church-threatening situation. The German church authorities are by no means taken with the increasing number of small families on the alleged basis of "quality, not quantity." They say that the present situation shows that "the ethically good is always the economically right." The German experts hold that France, where the death and birth rates are practically equal and the families small, shows no betterment of the individual, no heightening of the family quality.

And the "Kreuzzeitung" (1913) says: "Only religion can stay this danger. It must ever remain not an econo-

mic, or hygenic, or individualistic problem, but a problem of religion."

If one now asks which of the Churches has the advantage in this reduced birth rate the usual answer is the Catholic. But this is by no means so clear. In the case of the large cities, Catholic Cologne and Protestant Berlin, each alike fell off a little over 3 per cent. The fact seems to be that the greater decrease of births in Protestant sections, where this is the case, is to be explained, not by the Confession, but by the difference in the character of the population, the Evangelical being more in the industrial cities and also of the academic classes.

Dr. Seeberg thinks it the spirit of the times, and warns against the possibilities of its bringing weakness to the nation, to the individual and to the Church.

In the recent ten-years' interval (1902-12) the average excess of births over deaths varied widely in the different European countries. In Russia this excess was 18.81 to the thousand people; in Bulgaria 14.12; in Germany 13.64; in Holland 12.79; Belgium 8.61; in England 8.30; in Italy 6.05; and in France 1.42.

In the matter of marriages, there were in Germany in 1912 the highest number to that date—523,491, that is 7.66 marriages to the thousand of population. The average for ten years was 500,742, or 7.92 to the thousand.

Great care is taken by the German Church authorities to ascertain the exact religious relationship of all persons married. In 1913 there were 189,055 Protestant weddings, and a little less than half that number, 96,857, Catholic. Besides this there were 15,900 weddings in which the husband was Catholic and the wife Evangelical, and an almost equal number, 15,621, where the husband was Evangelical and the wife Catholic.

But the Church in Germany is not interested in births and marriages, as the State, for economic or social reasons, but wholly as a Church and for the development of the individual life religiously.

If then we ask ourselves how it stands with regard to the number of those who are baptized as related to the number born, we have here also the exact information.

From the Protestant marriages in 1913 were born 422,734 children, and of these there were 409,520 presented for baptism, that is, 96.87 per cent. Only 13,214 therefore were not baptized. Of the mixed marriages there were 57,572 children born in 1913. If the Protestants had had half of these their baptisms would have summed up 28,786, whereas in the Protestant Churches there were really baptized of this class 30,456, or 52.9 per cent. Of these mixed marriages heretofore the Catholics baptized the greater number, but now in 1913 only 47.1 per cent., indicating a swing to the advantage of the Evangelical Church. Of the whole number of children born in Prussia in 1913, 505,380, 483,904 were baptized, only 41¼ per cent. not being presented for this ordinance of the Church. If one follows this matter by provinces there is found a wide disparity. In Hanover with its strict Lutheran Church 98.93 per cent. of all children to the Evangelical Lutheran parents were baptized in 1913, while in Berlin the number reached but 92.88 per cent. Thus the statistics show a very excellent situation in reference to baptism.

If one looks to the official celebration of these marriages we find that the very great majority are solemnized by the Church. Of the Evangelical marriages, that is, those in which both husband and wife are members of the Evangelical Church, in Prussia 88.27 per cent. were church weddings, in Bavaria 95.94 per cent., in Alsace Lorraine 99.72 per cent., though Hamburg had only 75 per cent. of its marriages so solemnized.

Coming now to the matter of confirmation, we are interested to see how the baptized child is taken care of by the Church and what part of the number become confirmants of the Church. In Prussia in 1913 the Evangelical Church confirmed 512,567 souls born of Evangelical parents and who had been baptized in the Word. At the same time in Saxony there were confirmed 99,968, and in Bavaria 41,548. The maintenance of the custom is well fixed. Prussia is always a good average index of German church relations, neither worst nor best. In Prussia the year 1900 saw 433,380 confirmed; 1910, 495,-

441; and 1913 512,567. Thus the development here has kept pace with the population.

Moving on in the line of life, the Church's next figures tell us of these same baptized and confirmed as regards their participation in the Lord's Supper. For years there has been a gradual, even if minute, diminution in the number of persons presenting themselves for this sacrament. But in 1912 it was noted that the figures for the first time remained stationary. If no gain, at least there was no loss. And in 1913, first in a series of years, there was an increase in the number of communicants. Of course the figures for 1914 and 1915 would make very great advances, did we have them at hand. But 1912 and 1913 seem to show a real movement amongst the churches towards and not away from the means of grace. In 1913 8,089,396 persons communed in the Evangelical Churches of Prussia. In Hanover there were 1,191,234. In all Prussia 32.58 per cent. of the Protestant population communed. The German states differ here again very greatly. While in Posen 57.05 per cent. of the confirmed communed, in Berlin the percentage of the Evangelical church membership was but a little over 14 per cent. (14.38 per cent.) In Bavaria it rises to 62.04 per cent, and in Waldeck to 66.88 per cent. The hopeful thing is that Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hesse, Mecklenburg, Anhalt, Lubeck and Alsace Lorraine have actually and absolutely increased, and that quite perceptibly, in the communicants presenting themselves at the Supper. Schneider's *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* for 1915 (p. 458) says almost jubilantly, referring to this matter: "The constant recession of persons participating in the communion we have counted as one of the most serious matters confronting us. So much the more happy is it to note that finally the ban appears to be broken, and all the more so in that it has occurred in a year in which it was so little expected. Of course one can confidently anticipate a great gain in the coming year."

The relation of deaths and church burials also gives access to the feelings and religious attitude of men, and it also is closely kept account of in the German Church. In

the year 1913 361,106 persons confirmed in the Prussian Church passed by death. Of this number 309,100 were buried by the Church, that is, 85.6 per cent. of those dead were interred according to the rites of the Church. Now, in 1900 the church official burials were but 77.59 per cent., so that here too the figures point in the right direction. In Bavaria the per cent. of church burials rises to 98.09 per cent. I note the insertion of an "ad" in one German paper by a free-religion pastor of an independent organization, in which he announces himself open for all funeral calls of any kind, stating that he is a "religionsdrener" and has the right to officiate in the cemeteries. "Give me a call." It sounds quite American. (S. Jahrbuch 1915, p. 461).

Among the graver matters of the church life in a country like Germany, for centuries sharply divided up along confessional lines, is the matter of accessions from the bodies and recessions thereto, or conversions and perversions to and from the Evangelical Church. Very careful attention is always given to this situation so that on the instant one may know the relations, loss or gain, in the account, as well as the source and occasion thereof.

Naturally the chief factors here are the Evangelical and the Roman Catholic Church, and it is remarkable how closely they have maintained their relative place with regards to one another through the long series of years. In 1871 there were in all Germany out of every hundred men 62.31 Evangelicals and 36.21 Catholics. In 1880, 62.63 Evangelicals and 35.85 Catholics, an Evangelical gain and a Catholic loss. In 1890, 62.77 Evangelical and 35.76 Catholics, likewise an Evangelical gain and a Catholic loss. But in 1910 there were 61.59 out of each hundred Evangelicals, and 36.65 Catholics, a slight Catholic gain and Evangelical loss. Yet, as can be seen, in spite of immigration and war and political changes, there is less than one per cent. of a shift in the relation of the Evangelical and Catholic Churches in Germany in a period of almost 50 years. If it shows nothing else, it at least proves the infinitely careful conservation by each

Church of its own population even down to the individual including each infant born.

In 1910 5,746 persons came by "Uebertritt" into the Prussian Evangelical Church. In 1913 the number coming in from other bodies rose to 7,379. Throughout Germany there were in this same year 10,306 accessions to the Evangelical Church. Of these 462 came from the Jews, 8,597 from the Catholics, and 1,247 from the sectarians. In recent times about 400 came annually into the Church from the Jews, and 8,000 and over annually from the Catholics, and in recent years 1,000 or over yearly came back from the sectarian missions. These latter are of those who in former years have gone out and not finding what they sought return to the bosom of their mother Church—in this case the Evangelical Protestant Church of Germany.

If now we look at the losses—those who go from the Church—these too are to be found interesting figures. To the Jews go over from year to year about an average of 60. In 1913 there were 58. These are without significance, and wholly due to intermarriages. Turning to the Roman Catholic column, we find in 1913 952 persons leaving the Protestant Church of Germany for the Roman Catholic, and this is about the average of the last years. Place this yearly loss to the Roman Catholic Church over against the annual gain from them of almost 8,000—in 1913, 8,597—we are heartened. The outgo to the Catholics, except in some special individual cases, is also occasioned chiefly by intermarriage, while the reverse movement to the Protestant Church has its chief incentive in the positive evangelical note mixed, be it said, in some cases with a political factor. The "Los vom Rom" movement which brought large numbers to the Evangelical Church in Austria and southeast Germany in recent years has not yet lost its momentum. This is shown from the fact that of the 6,193 converts from Catholicism (in 1913) to the Prussian Church, 1,677 were in Silesia. Yet the movement is quite general; Brandenburg brought in 471; Catholic Westphalia 838; even the indifferent Berlin 585; Saxony 861; Bavaria 386, and Alsace Lorraine

92. So that the relation of Catholics and Protestants in the German Reich seems, so far as personal exchanges of church membership goes, to favor Protestantism.

There are however two other losses to the Evangelical Church of more consequence, one to the different Christian Sectarian movements, and another a breaking loose entirely from any and all Christian Churches and creeds.

These figures are for Prussia alone. For Germany the figures are respectively: 4,537, 4,680, 4,869, 5,249. In 1910, 2,586 persons left the Evangelical Church for other Protestant Church relations; in 1911, 2,789; 1912, 2,572; 1913, 3,159. Yet on the whole these losses too have lessened. In 1908, for instance, there were 10,224 of these losses. In very recent years fewer have left the Church to the Sectarian missions in Bavaria, Saxony and Hesse. These losses go to the Baptists, Methodists, Irvingites (the Holy Apostolic Church), and also, and not to be overlooked, to the so-called "Gemeinschaftsbewegung." Most of these latter are earnest Christians and their loss to the Evangelical Church is to be lamented. However, a symptom of encouragement is that by far the larger number of these "Gemeinschaft" people remain in the Church and form centers of active evangelical light and warmth in their congregations. The "Gemeinschaft" problem in the German Church is a serious one, but in recent years is developing a solution favorable to the established Church, through a wiser leadership on the part of the "Gemeinschaft" people themselves, and also a kindlier spirit manifest by the Church itself to the movement.

The most alarming loss to the Evangelical Church in recent years, and one threatening for a time dire disaster, is the so-called "Austrittsbewegung" which, fomented by the Social Democrats and vigorously promoted by the "Haeckel Monisten Bund" and allied materialistic organizations, seemed liable to sweep everything before it. Of course the war with its rekindled religion has given quickened power in a thousand churches. But even before the war loomed dark on the horizon, the backbone of the "Austrittsbewegung" seemed to be broken. In 1913,

23,000 left the Church on practically atheistic grounds. This is largely from Prussia, 19,479, and these chiefly from Berlin, 12,463. Special propaganda had been made in the latter place against the Church with the idea of organizing a great movement which once in motion with a popular swing would carry tens of thousands with it. This phase of the organized purpose was a pronounced failure. Outside of Prussia the loss to the Church from this materialistic movement was only 3,517. In Bavaria, Saxony, Baden and Hamburg religious recessions were less in 1913 than the preceding year.

When one casts an eye over the atheistic literature of the time and notes the violent efforts to kill the Church then and there, and then turns to observe the very indifferent results of the movement, courage comes flowing back into the heart. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The Haeckel Bund arranged to have "Reformation Day," 1912, marked by hundreds of thousands asking the Church for dismissals or expressing their release from its bounds and bonds. Then these thousands were to smilingly say "adieu" to the Church, and thereby as they said, "the Christian Church was to receive a deadly wound." But in reality the 1912 Reformation Day passed with relatively little response to this effort to kill the Church. On the 10th of March, 1913, a leaflet was distributed throughout Berlin called "Der Befreiungskampf 1913," appealing for "die Losreissung von der Fremdenherrschaft der Kirche." Great efforts were made in the same direction by the Komitee "Konfessionslos" in Hamburg and Munich. They expected thousands to leave the Church in a day. In the city of Nuremburg the total result was 130. Pastor Keller, the true Saxon evangelist, says: "Let them go. Their very going will waken again a real reformation in the Church."

Oftentimes too, a wrong impression is made by persons leaving the Church. Frequently the ground is not religious nor doctrinal nor ecclesiastical but wholly local and personal. Thus 268 announced their purpose to withdraw from a Church in Westphalia because they were

only a branch Church and had not been made into an independent parish (Jahrbuch 1913, p. 545).

We will close this phase of the discussion by some facts which the figures for Saxony disclose regarding the coming and going of members of the State Church, in this case the Evangelical Lutheran. The figures are for 1911. In that year the Saxon Lutheran Church lost to others 1,429 and gained from the same sources 1,160. For instance, 25 went to the Baptists and 20 Baptists came back; 5 went to the Jews and 29 came from them; 19 went to the so-called Old Lutherans (Mo.) and 11 came back; 210 went to the Methodists and 41 came back; 54 went to the Roman Catholics and 938 came from them. When one considers the Church as it is in Germany with Roman Catholics, Jews, Sectarian Missions and atheistic propaganda after its people, and then looks at the meagre excess of its losses over its gains one cannot but feel a sense of exhilaration at its stability and faith. Figures give the facts.

Pastoral changes occur also in the European Churches, though, let us acknowledge with gratitude to the great Head of the Church, they are much less prominent in the current history of its pastors. In 1913, in Prussia, out of 81,000 ministerial places there were 793 positions filled. Of these, 438 were by those previously in regular pastoral positions; 222 by men heretofore assistants, and 133 from the ranks of Kandidatten, that is, newly ordained. It is to be seen that candidates for the ministry in Germany are coming on. If one inquires the ground of these 793 changes, in the Prussian Church they are classified under six several heads. 84 vacancies were caused by the death of the previous incumbent; 98 through regular retirement; 379 by transfer; 4 by resignation; 3 by dismissal and 57 by reason of newly made places, largely new churches. In 1912 there had been 74 such new places, showing a vital reaching out by the Church annually towards meeting larger demands of an increasing population.

It is of interest to note that of the pastoral positions filled during the year 1913, 27.36 per cent. were named

by the official authorities of the State Church, 37.28 per cent. were the appointments of patrons—a matter of serious consequence to the Church's life—and, what is quite hopeful, 35.36 per cent. through the elections by the congregations interested. The latter is a growing custom as the figures indicate.

The State in Germany takes care of the Church financially, having therefor five several funds or budgets. First, the General Fund for the State Church. This is for general expenses, for the payment of salaries of pastors in cases which are not otherwise met, for pensions of pastors and the taking care of pastors' widows and orphans. Second, the fund for the payment of assistant pastors needed in the larger congregations. Third, the fund for taking care of special Church needs in the great cities and in industrial sections. Fourth, the fund for looking after members of the Evangelical Church outside of Germany. And fifth, a fund for the general expenses of administration through the general synod. The three last named show that even if tardy, the State yet is not wholly deaf to the Church's modern needs.

If now on the other hand it is asked what the congregations themselves do towards contributing for Church and charity, the statistics too tell the tale, not always either a satisfying one, yet one increasingly hopeful. The last year (1913) the collections of the Church in Prussia amounted to 1,933,191 marks, or the not insignificant sum of about \$500,000.

Remembering our own parochial reports and the objects of our benevolence as therein shown, the distribution by the German Evangelical Church of its contributed benevolence becomes a matter of interest. The objects as shown by the most recent distributions are made up in this way: Needy congregations (our Home Missions), Bible Societies, aiding theological students (Ministerial Aid), "Heiden Mission" (Foreign Missions), "Juden Mission" (Missions to Jews), the Inner Mission, taking care of the poor of the Church, Deaconess work including institutions for the blind, sick, imbeciles and for education, the widows and orphans of pastors, church and par-

sonage funds, and the Gustavus Adolphus Foundation (an organization for aiding Evangelical Christians in Roman Catholic countries). This distribution in itself shows a keen alertness to all the several sides of the Church's present-day life, though the amount of contributed gifts does not total as the friends of the Church could wish.

What about church buildings in Germany? Do they suffice for the gospel needs? The inadequacy of church buildings has been much exploited, and there is some ground for this, though here again the complaint has been much overdrawn. In 1913, 212 Evangelical churches were dedicated in Prussia. Of these 77 were quite new, 135 enlarged and rebuilt. Of the newly built churches 27 were in places which before had no church. The figures for church building are given in Germany with thoroughness only every ten years, the last and general statement covering the period between 1900 and 1910. This showed in Prussia 11,924 Evangelical churches. In addition there were 1,598 chapels and 2,975 halls and places of church meeting and work. Taking the Evangelical population there was in 1910 in Prussia one place of worship for each 1,339 souls, and this number of souls per place has been materially decreased since then. In their proportion of people to church space the different sections of the kingdom differ sharply. Thus while in Posen in the east there are but 880 souls to the church edifice, there are in Berlin the threateningly great number of 10,301. Of course the sudden and surprising expansion of Berlin, the great central capital, on the one hand, and on the other the slowness of the government there, with its heavy Social Democratic majority, to do anything for the spread of the Church, are the two causes of the anomalous condition of Berlin in the matter of lack of churches. To the end of bettering the Berlin City Mission, Pastor Stoecker, the Kaiserin and others have wrought with unremitting zeal. And conditions are also here bettering. Worst of all in this matter is the city of Hamburg with 16,290 (in 1910) souls to each church. Rapid growth, the mixed character of its popu-

lace as Germany's greatest port, and its government as a "free city," are the grounds set forth usually to account for a situation not creditable to either Church or State.

The number of candidates for the pastoral office, with us so burning a question, is also in the German Church a matter of serious concern. The statistics here as in other departments are sharp and definite, yet may be misleading, for some of those taking the so-called "first" and "second" examinations may simply become church parochial teachers and not finally receive ordination. In 1913 in Prussia 136 candidates were ordained to the gospel ministry. This, however, is a sharp falling off and one which unfortunately has been a regular annual decline. In 1912 there were in Prussia 170 men ordained by the Evangelical Church. In 1905 the number of the ordained was 257; in 1900, 295; and in 1895, 312. The drop in the Prussian Landes Kirche from 312 to 136 in 18 years is somewhat of a sinister portent. Candidates who have passed their "first year" examinations make a better showing. While in 1895 there were 364 passed, the number had dropped in 1910 to 179 and in 1912 to 171. But in 1913 it increased to 196. There were slight gains everywhere save in Brandenburg (Berlin).

The figures for south Germany, notably Bavaria, are promising. An examination of the number of ministerial candidates of the Evangelical Church in Bavaria, running back several decades, shows the maintenance of a fair average of men for the pastorate. In the 30 years from 1825 to 1855 there were 1,035 candidates, an average of 34. From 1855 to 1885 there were only 756, an average of but 23, but from 1885 to 1913 there were 1,069, giving the relatively high average of 45. The lowest year was 1879 with 15 examined; the highest 1891 which furnished 71 men for the Bavarian ministry. In Bavaria they anticipate their normal needs will be supplied by 1914 classes.

For Germany in General the situation as already indicated is less favorable, yet having a degree of hopefulness. "So much is certain," says an authority (Schnei-

der, 1915, 480), "that expectant, competent seekers after the ministerial office in Prussia at this time are all too few, far beneath the practical needs. In some sections the need is dire, and stands not at the door, but has already entered the premises." The normal annual need for Prussia is about 300 candidates, yet there is a feeling that the 196 in Prussia's first year (1913) class marks the beginning of a normal advance on which the Church dares to count. "The depression is overcome", says one. "Greater numbers can be expected this coming year." But this authority adds: "The loss of the war, which one may not yet finally reckon, is not to be overlooked, for the young theological world of the Fatherland has yielded up its sacrifice of manhood as scarcely another rank can parallel", and it will require an accelerated increase of theological students to fill the vacant places. Spite of all, the men who know the Church, believe that by 1916 or 1917 the normal number of ministerial students will be enrolled, and by 1918 or 1920 the pastoral office will again be satisfactorily supplied with the requisite number of prepared men. It might be well to add that the Prussian Church authorities like to have a class of about 300 when the need requires 250, as giving about the proper surplus which will be whittled away in the three years course by failures, mental, moral and physical, and otherwise. In the year 1912, 16 men dropped out of a class; in 1913 only 5, of whom 2 were lost by removal (from Germany, I would suppose) and 3—note it—turned to other callings.

Looking a bit further back, at the total number of students attending the great German universities, we find almost up to the war an ever increasing list, from 41,928 in the summer semester 1905, to 54,847 in 1910, and reaching 59,973 in the summer semester of 1913. In the winter semester of 1914-15 the number matriculated was 52,547. Of the present number it is of interest to note that 30,104, or more than one half are in the field. Doubtless at this time this number is considerably increased. This same situation obtains in Austria and Hungary. The universities of Germany mat-

riculated 52,708 and had present 29,863. The Austrian universities had 19,335 matriculated and but 8,271 present. The total number of all the students of the higher faculties in Austro-Germany (1914-15) was 93,446, of whom 49,720 were at work in the universities and 43,726 were in the trenches. This loss in the lists of those in course of preparation is bound also to fall heavily upon the Churches. At this date 1585 professors in these faculties were also at the front. It may be a surprise to some of us that from 1905 the number of theological students in the Evangelical faculties of the German universities has constantly increased, greatly to the joy of those who had noted the warning figures for a long series of years. In the summer semester, 1905, there were 2,277 such theological students. After this we find a gradual increase. In 1910 there were 2,535. Then the number swells regularly and normally; in 1911, 2,811; in 1912, 3,318; in 1913, 3,864, and in 1914, the sum of the Evangelical students for the ministry at the universities reached the high total of 4,366, almost attaining the previous record of 4,536 students reached in 1890. Of these Tübingen had 516, Berlin 497, Leipzig 450 and Halle 393.

Under "Church Statistics", and we do not question the justice of the classification, the German government places the problem of divorce, which with them as with us is making so profound an inroad into the Christian domesticity. The divorces in the German Reich in 1912 totalled 16,911, of which Prussia furnished 10,797. This is an average of 25 divorces to each 100,000 people of the kingdom. The divorces in 1912 increased 1131, almost all in Prussia, Bavaria really receding in its number of marriage dissolutions. There are now in Germany about 130,000 orphans, children of dissolved marriages. Much the greater per cent. of the divorces come from the cities, so that the Church authorities say in view thereof: "Increased religious attention to the great cities is the most important duty of the Church for the future."

Here then we have a Church which gives us in detail,

as a part of its own work, statistics annual and accurate of births, baptisms, instruction, confirmation, marriage, relation of births and baptized, mixed marriages, their progeny, communicants at the Lord's Supper, gains and losses to the Church in all possible ways, collections, propaganda, candidates and students for the ministry.

Who says it is not inspiring? Such a schedule of figures as these presented, beginning at birth, registering and covering all those phases of the religious and social-religious life capable of statistical measurement, must give to a Church a sense of definiteness in devotion, of freedom in action and of mastery in programming the tomorrow work of the Church which our own less adequate usage does not provide. It may be said that this is a German and not inherently a Lutheran adjustment. Be that as it may, it is a part of an efficient system and is in itself a mark of efficiency which we would do well to let serve us in our present need of systematic betterment. For any of the lines of investigation above perused lend themselves to a great series of interpretations alike stimulating to the individual and productive to the body of the Church. They thereby become the Church's helpers, and not only for this day, but for the one next coming. And if these figures are but "servers of tables" yet thereby, as in the olden day (Acts 6:23), it is made possible for others to give themselves more "continually to prayer and the ministry of the word." De Quincy's distinction in which he discriminates a literature of fact and a literature of power can never to us Lutheran be valid. For with us a literature of power is such because it is also a literature of fact.

Springfield, Ohio.

Hamma Divinity School,

ARTICLE IV.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ST. PAUL'S LUTHERAN
CHURCH, RHINEBECK, N. Y.

BY REV. CHESTER H. TRAVER, D.D.

PART I. PRELUDE.

During the past few decades there has been awakened a newborn interest in ancestral homes. The persistent investigation of old historic books, mouldy receipts, antique church records and quaint wills have disclosed much history of intense interest and abiding worth.

We, however, have not entered upon this search like one who wrote "A remote descendant of this ancient family claims the ownership of several hundred acres of ground in the heart of Baltimore, Md., and should like to have it and without delay! And if the agent secured it, the recipient promised to build a church and a parsonage and a stable annex." Through the assistance of reminiscent minds, many of whom have since left us for a season, we have collected some material supposed to be irretrievably lost. Our work has not been to create but locate, not to theorize but trace out lines of history.

There are yet many theories to be solved or dissolved, which we will consider as time permits and leave the rest for our successors. Thus

"Dreams of that which cannot die,
Bright visions came to me,
As lapped in thought I use to lie,
And gaze into the summer sky,
Where the sailing clouds went by,
Like ships upon the sea ;

"Dreams that the soul of youth engage
Ere fancy has been quelled ;
Old legends from the monkish page,
Traditions of the Saints and sage,
Tales that have the rime of age.
And Chronicles of Eld."

—H. W. Longfellow.

By the act of the First General Assembly held at Fort James in New York City, Nov. 1, 1683, the State was divided into twelve counties. One of these was called Dutchess county and its boundaries were then fixed to "Bee from the bounds of the County of Westchester on the south side of the Highlands along the east side of the Hudson's Rivers as farre as Roelof Jansens Creek and eastward into the woods twenty miles."

Oct. 1, 1691, the last clause was changed to read "Eastward into the woods twelve miles," which amendment was confirmed by the King, May 20, 1708.

In 1683 there seems to have been no settlers within these prescribed bounds but on the west bank of the river at Esopus were the Holland, Dutch and French Huguenots, of whom Hon. Francis R. Tillou wrote, "They were of all ranks and occupations—men of letters and science, agriculturists, artists, surgeons, physicians, manufacturers, mechanics, artisans, vineyard men, laborers and ministers, men who were ever true to their friends but a terror to their enemies."

Thence came the first settlers into our town, which they called, Kipsbergen in 1702 and Rhinebeck after 1737.

June 29, 1703, the act was passed to lay out from Kings Bridge, N. Y., to Crawley, opposite Albany, what is now known as the Post Road, of a breadth of four rods English measure at the least. In many places it never was one-half this width.

October 4, 1710, under the leadership of Rev. Joshua Kocherthal, a Lutheran minister, there arrived at East Camp, known for decades as "Ye Camp," and West Camp, the Palatines whose settlement and dispersion can be traced in the history of those and sister churches. Rev. J. Kocherthal was a gentle, scholarly spirit of poetic taste, with a most winning manner. His church records are a model. We were fortunate in being able to have them translated by Rev. Christian Krahmer and published by Benjamin Brink in Olde Ulster from which we quote a few entries:

Baptism No. 65, July 8, 1711, was at the Upper Settlement (West Camp).

“Joseph, child of Gabriel and Susanna Hoffman. Sponsors: Joseph Reichart and his wife Anna Maria Traver.

NO. 115, Jan. 6, 1712—Anna Catharine, born Dec. 31, 1711, child of Heinrich and Anna Margretha Mohr; sponsors: Anna Sibylla Catharina Kehlin, Philipp Mohr and Anna Elizabeth Stahlin.

We also copy two marriages because the parties later came to Rhinebeck. The first was in New York before sailing up the Hudson:

Aug. 29, 1710—Carl Nahr, widower, a tanner of Birckenfield in Westerich and Maria Apolonia, daughter of the late Mathesen of Eckersweil in the Country of Zweibenecken.

At West Camp, married, January 9, 1711, Joseph Reichart of Kirchberg, County of Marburg, grandduchy of Wuerttemberg, a widower and Anna Maria, widow of the late Johann Niclaus Treber, a wheelwright, of Wollstein in the county of Crentznach, Germany.

PART II. INTRODUCTORY.

When in 1714 forty families, attracted by the offers of Henry Beekman, came from East and West Camp and settled on his Rhinebeck patent, then known as Kipsbergen, their pastor, Rev. Joshua Kocherthal, then living at West Camp, looked after their spiritual interests. The record reads that at Kirchenhoeck, Apr. 3, 1715, he confirmed Valentine Schaeffer. Oct. 14, 1716, and Apr. 29, 1717, the same rite was administered. The baptismal records were by him as also the marriages.

Among his efficient members were Michael Bonesteel, Carl Neher, Henry Schaeffer, Barent Sipperly, Joseph Reichart and Bastian Traver. They worshipped with the German Reformed members who came with them and doubtless jointly built the first church of any denomination in the Town of Rhinebeck, which then included Red Hook. It was situated at Kirchehoek, i. e., the church corner, on the property now owned by Edward Wey.

We think they brought along the name of Rheinbach as Carl Neher, one of their members, a listmaster in 1710

came from Rheinbach, Germany, a small village about 50 miles south of Cologne and 8 miles back from the river Rhein. They had come to a country which only the previous year, 1713, had elected its first representative to the General Assembly.

But Dutchess county proved so inviting to settlers that June 24, 1719, it had a "County House and Prison. Its early Court business was transacted at Kingston, Ulster county and the officials of Ulster acted for both counties until July 6, 1721, when Governor Burnet granted a Court of Common Pleas."

In 1719, according to the census, there were 97 freeholders, of whom 46 were Palatines, in the north ward extending from Clines Sopas Island to the new border of Albany county (for in 1717 Livingston Manor was transferred from Dutchess to Albany county). The list of (The Palatines as published by E. M. Smith was:

Hans Jacob Dencks, Nicholas Row, Valentine Bender, Philip Feller, Johannes Risdorph, Barent Noll, George Shufelt, Ananias Teel, Frederick Mayer, Valentine Woleben, Henrich Shaver, Peter Tipple, Nicholas Emeigh, Carl Uhl, Hans Lambert, Martin Wheatman, Johannes Row, Peter Dob, Valentin Shaver, Bastian Traver, Johannes Berenger, William Simon, Adam Dencks, Christian Berg, Lazarous Dorn, Peter Woleben, Carl Neher, Phillips, Cooper, George Thater, Hans George Brigell, Hans Adam Frederick, Henrich Shearman, Johannes Backus, Andries Frantz, George Saltsman, Frantz Kelder, Joseph Reichart, Laurence Thater, Alburtus Schreiber, Henrich Uhl, Adam Eckert, Stephen Frolich, Nicholas Bonensteel, Martin Broog, Johannes Dob, Peter Woleben, Jr., Dirk De Duytser, Wendel Pulver, Martin Burger, John George Eckert, George Shaver, Philip Solomon.

Thus it is apparent that the Bergs, Berringers, Eckerts, Emeighs, Fellers, Frolichs, Lamberts, Nehers, Rows, Reicharts, Schaeffers, Schreibers, Tipples, Thaters, and Trebers came to stay and are here now.

In 1719 Rev. J. Kocherthal died at West Camp where his body now lies beneath the present church. Rev. Justus Falckner ordained in 1703 was pastor in New York

and New Jersey but from 1719 until his death in Claverack, Columbia county, N. Y., in 1723 he served the whole field along the Hudson. In the year of his death we find Rev. J. Spahler at Kirchehoek who remained for about a decade in our town.

In 1722 there was a further increase in the number of the Palatines.

Oct 23, 1723, each county was authorized to elect a supervisor, treasurer, assessors and collector. The assessment roll of 1723 listed 97 taxpayers who paid at the rate of one shilling a pound on 1088 pounds, 15 s., 7d., i. e., 54 pounds tax. This list is in *Historic Old Rhinebeck* c/o 420 by H. H. Morse, edition 1908.

Rev. Spahler continued until 1733 and in 1734 one Carl Rudolph, who called himself Prince of Wurtemberg, an imposter, succeeded in receiving a call from St. Peters (Stone) Church, Germantown and Tarbush. This lasted only a short time as in 1737 they acknowledged Rev. W. C. Berkenmyer, pastor at Athens (1725-1751), as their pastor. He could not visit them often and yet was pastor until Rev. J. C. Hartwick came in 1746 and remained 12 years.

Another imposter in the county was John Lodwick Hofgood who by deception was granted authority by Gov. George Clinton as a minister. He lived at Backwack, Dutchess county, and Poghquaick.

In 1738 another Palatine immigration occurred which seems to have settled further from the river, choosing the higher lands rather than "The Flats." Among these were the Wegers and Marquardts, Boltz and Gugenheims, who had heard of this Canaan from their friends already here. These obtained leases but we have not yet discovered at what date these were given.

During the pastorate of Rev. J. C. Hartwig, services were held in a church in or near Stattsburg as we learn from a letter written by the pastor while absent in Pennsylvania in 1750-1751. He was very eccentric but a zealous worker for Christ. He traveled on horseback over the hills of Dutchess and Columbia counties, solemnizing marriages, administering the sacraments and comfort-

ing the sorrowing. He thus met those who became the nucleus of this congregation. As he rode over Wurttemberg hill, gazed southward over the valley, visited with Leonard Weger on the farm now owned by M. S. Frost, or below the hill on the north counseled with Michael Boltz, they doubtless consulted about the need of a church in this community and perhaps agreed upon the site. As services were held in the homes the necessity increased with the leases granted to new settlers.

PART III. ASSOCIATED HISTORY.

Whether Rev. J. C. Hartwick perfected any organization we cannot say yet, it would seem as if something had been done, because within six months after he left the field in 1758 and within three months after his successor, Rev. John Frederick Reis was elected, Jan. 7, 1759, the aforementioned Leonard Weger and Michael Boltz applied in the name of the Wuerttemberg people on March 20, 1759 to Col. Henry Beekman for permission to build and requested a site for a church. Col. Beekman replied, Messrs. Weger and Boltz:

Having received your letter of the 20th ult. concerning leave to build a church, &c., which reasonable request I willingly grant and give you what assurance that shall be adjudged for such purpose necessary. Wishing you good prosperity in the meanwhile am and remain

Your well-wishing friend,

HENRY BEEKMAN.

In accordance with said permission a church was built. Who can describe their joy as they joined here in the songs of Zion, however plain the structure.

In 1769 Michael Boltz exchanged his lease of his farm now held by Mrs. Susanna Ackert for a deed of the same.

Sept. 5, 1774, a tract of $17\frac{3}{4}$ acres of land lying west of the "Jacomintic Fly Conveyance," (its earlier name was Mansakenning) was conveyed by Henry Beekman to Johannes Markwat, Michael Boltz and Adam Dipple, trustees "for the sole and only proper use, benefit and behoof of the Protestant Church now erected in the southeast

part of Rhinebeck commonly called Whitaberger Land."

June 1, 1785, George and Sebastian Pultz, Paul and Sebastian Weger, deeded to David Traver, Peter Traver and George Marquart of Charlotte precinct as trustees, two acres, together with all and singular the buildings, church and churchyard being now distinguished as the Wirtemberg Church."

The deed states that the conveyance is for "the use and benefit of the Protestant congregation or society of said Church so as they do not occupy part of the said two acres of land for any other purpose than for a church and burying ground." The Church probably was soon incorporated.

Thus the Church became a unit and members from St. Peters (Stone) Church and "Stadtsburgher" Kirche were its charter members. The record of baptisms, and marriages for nearly half a century may be found at "Ye Camp," West Camp, St. Peters (Stone) Church, Athens or even in New York City as the same pastors served all these fields.

Our fathers also believed in secular education. Feb. 7, 1796, George and Sebastian Pultz granted a release in so far that a school house might be erected on the north part of the lot. Rev. J. F. Reis, the first pastor of the associated Lutheran Churches of Dutchess and Columbia counties, lived in "Ye Camp" where a new parsonage was built for him and under him began the third period in our history which continued until 1836, i. e., 77 years.

Rev. Reis' first record here was a baptism, Oct. 22, 1760, of Salome, daughter of William Berger; second, Rosina, June 8, 1760, daughter of Henry Buis; third, Mathias, son of Mathias Marshall; fourth, Margaretha, daughter of Eberhard Weger.

In 1776 there are three records by another hand. In 1780 there is a new form during part of the year. We hope later to fill in this gap from sources at present unavailable.

During the pastorate of Rev. Reis we became a nation and passed there the struggle of the American Revolution. Well writes the poet:

"Once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world."

"So nigh is grandeur to our dust
So near is God to man,
Where duty whispers low, thou must,
The youth replies, I can."

This congregation furnished its quota and all may read the names in "New York in the Revolution," published by the Empire State in 1898, second edition.

With the close of that struggle, Rev. Reis divided the charge, retaining the Churches in Columbia county.

From Oct. 1783 to July 1784 there is no record by any pastor but from July 1784 to Oct. 1785, Rev. William Graff "Prediger in der Jersey" served as supply. His records show the depth of the work of his predecessor. Rev. George Henry Pfeiffer served St. Peters (Stone) Church and Wurtemberg from May 1, 1786, to 1794, when his health failed and he continued St. Peters only, until Jan. 1798. He died Oct. 26, 1827.

Rev. J. F. Ernst was on the field either as pastor or supply for a brief period. In 1797 while pastor of Athens and Churchtown he was elected as the first resident professor of Hartwick Seminary, New York. An advertisement of that same year may interest those especially who are beginning to talk as if electric trains were slow. It reads: "Albany stages will leave New York every day at ten o'clock in the morning; arrive at Albany the fourth day at nine o'clock in the morning. Fare for each passenger, seven dollars."

Only 10 years passed when Aug. 18, 1807, at noon the Clermont passed our Rhinebeck docks, Slate and Long Dock. Pete Sleight who saw it vomiting fire and smoke fled to Jacques Tavern on the Flatts, exclaiming "The devil has gone up the river on a sawmill." For years after that yet when farmers visited the city, the sloop was their hotel, the Captain their bank, and Canal Street outside the city business circle.

Rev. Frederick H. Quitman, D.D., of Schoharie, N. Y.,

received a joint call from four churches, "Ye Camp," St. Peters, Tarbush and Wurtemberg, and became pastor Feb. 8, 1798. He agreed to give Wurtemberg "Nine Sundays and one festival day for 30 pounds in New York money and 8 bushels of wheat." During his first year they erected the present parsonage at St. Peters Lutheran Church for him. The strenuousness of his life is seen from the additional work performed, having Churchtown under his care, 1802-3, and reorganizing Woodstock in 1806.

But the body must yield. Feb. 4, 1815, he divided the field retaining the Dutchess county Churches as his parish. He then made a new agreement "On every third Sunday at Wurtemberg, one winter Sunday excepted, as follows: during the summer (May to October) two sermons, one English and one German, and, during the winter (November through April) one sermon, for \$200 and 30 loads of wood."

Owing to some unrecorded cause services were no longer held at Staatsburg and the building in 1802 was taken down and the lumber used in remodeling this Church.

In 1807 Morgan Lewis and Gertrude Livingston, his wife, the granddaughter of Henry Beekman, gave their legal consent for the sale of the 17 3-4 acres donated in 1774 to help pay the debt incurred a few years before. The petition was signed by the trustees of the Lutheran St. Paul's Church in the Town of Rhinebeck called Wurtemberg.

Owing to infirmity, Rev. Quitman resigned Wurtemberg in 1825. He was a man of commanding presence, highly respected by all just persons, but fearless anywhere. A large congregation assembled at his funeral in 1832 at St. Peters (Stone) Church to pay their tribute to his worth as a man, a citizen and as a pastor and preacher.

Rev. W. J. Eyer began his work at Wurtemberg Sept. 1825. In 1828 Dr. Quitman was unable to preach and both Churches again became a pastorate which agree-

ment continued nine years. In 1832 the Church was repaired and improved.

Under the care of Rev. Eyer, English became the pulpit language.

When occasion required he assisted other Churches as he enrolls fifteen names at Wurtemberg as admitted as members of the West Camp Lutheran Church, Aug. 11, 1828. Sometimes he called it the Universal Lutheran Christian Church.

PART IV. ERA OF INDEPENDENCE.

After a short vacancy the Conference supplied the Church until its spring session in March 1838. June 8, 1838, Rev. A. T. Geissenhainer was called but remained only two years, until Aug. 1840. His brother, Rev. Dr. F. W. Geissenhainer assisted Dr. Augustus Wackerhagen at the installation in September 1838. He entered the ministry in 1835 and died March 2, 1882.

June 20, 1841, Rev. Rumph supplied the pulpit and baptized three children.

After prolonged vacancy, acting under the advice of Rev. Dr. Pohlman, a committee of one was sent to interview Rev. Charles A. Smith, then pastor at Stone Arabia, Montgomery county, who was persuaded to accept a call. His first baptism was June 19, 1842, and the last December 25, 1849, in all 49 names. As Rev. Smith lived in Rhinebeck village and many Lutherans had moved there, he soon organized the Third Evangelical Lutheran Church of Rhinebeck and preached for both on alternate Sundays until the village needed all his service. He was among the new measure men of that day, believing in revivals and temperance. This awakened such bitter hostility that the dissatisfied portion which withdrew, appealed to the New York Ministerium holding its 53rd session in Red Hook, N. Y., Sept. 1848. After hearing the case, the following was adopted, "Resolved that the control of the church property being placed by law under the trustees in office, it is out of our power to interfere in the affairs of the Wurtemberg Church; therefore the declara-

tion from former members of that congregation cannot be sustained by this synod.

Resolved, That this Synod cherishes undiminished confidence in the ministerial character and deportment of Rev. Chas. A. Smith, and in the present congregational organization of the Wurtemberg Church; and we believe that in the course which he has pursued as pastor of said Church, he has been actuated by a solemn sense of duty to God and the interests of vital religion."

During that struggle as the pastor came to the church one Sabbath, he saw many intently looking up into the Basswood tree standing along the west fence. His enemies had placed his effigy there. But truth is mighty and prevailed. The Secretary of the Church was also warned not to pass a certain barn where the seceders held their meetings. He replied, "I cannot die in a better cause."

Rev. William N. Scholl, D.D., became pastor in 1851. His first baptism was dated April 13, 1851, and the last, February 18, 1855. During his pastorate the church was repaired and refitted at a cost of \$400.

October 2, 1852, a Wurtemberg Cemetery Association was formed with Jacob G. Lambert president, and Gideon A. Traver secretary. It was incorporated January 6, 1855, and recorded January 19, 1855. October 2, 1852, they bought an acre of land but have twice added to it. To-day the number interred, as having answered the final roll call, is double the roster of the Church. The parsonage was then in the village. Dr. Scholl did not keep any horse but was always very prompt. He also preached at Clinton Hollow or Schultzville in the afternoon, walking to and fro. His Christian spirit won nearly all. His style was peculiar, but he was thoroughly scriptural in his preaching and conscientiously faithful in his pastoral work.

Rev. George Neff, D.D., was pastor twenty-one years, July 1855 to July 1876. He had been licensed in this Church Sept. 13, 1842. He was installed Oct. 11, 1855, by Revs. Drs. H. N. Pohlman, W. D. Strobel and M. Sheeleigh. He enrolled 87 infant baptisms. He fostered the

advanced ideas of his predecessors. By his genial spirit he won the respect of the people.

When in 1867 the question arose, should this congregation advise the Ministerium of New York to leave the General Synod. It instructed its pastor and delegate to vote against withdrawal. At a subsequent meeting St. Paul's voted to become a charter member of the Synod of New York which met in Red Hook, N. Y., October 1867. Dr. Neff was secretary both of the Ministerium and the new Synod also the president of Synod from 1878 to 1886 when he resigned before the expiration of his term of office. He removed to Poughkeepsie where he died Aug. 1900, leaving two children, Susanna, wife of P. E. Ackert, a lawyer, and John, living in Pennsylvania.

The New York Ministerium met here in 1842, 1859 and 1868. In 1859 the ministers residing in New Jersey asked the privilege of withdrawal to form a new Synod which was granted.

I recently examined the roll of that Synod and of the fifty-nine names recorded only one is living and a member of the Synod, Rev. Alfred Hiller, D.D., theological professor at Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.

In 1857 the pastor convinced the Church that he could not do the work as well while living in Rhinebeck village. The then sexton house was remodeled for him with the promise of a new parsonage soon.

The Civil War caused a delay until 1870 when the present building was erected. One cause of delay was putting a basement under the church in 1860. At that time the north gallery was removed and the pulpit put in the recess then built. A hall was added to the south and the old bell hung in the new tower. Stoves gave way to a heater in the basement. For fifteen years the Sabbath school was held there.

The community took such an interest in music that for several years a large class in vocal culture was held for a term of twenty weeks each winter. The annual turkey supper each November for fifty-five years has become the home gathering of the flock.

In 1860 land became available and a shed association

was incorporated which purchased land on which are now fifty stalls, "the merciful man is merciful to his beast."

Rev. Dr. Neff received his preparatory training at Hartwick Seminary and was a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa. This was his last pastorate, but for ten years he supplied many pulpits while his counsel was widely sought.

Rev. J. G. Griffith was pastor from Sept. 1, 1876, to April 1881. He was installed on November 8 by the Rev. Drs. W. D. Strobel and G. F. Stelling, assisted by the retiring pastor, also Revs. Wm. Hull and S. G. Finckel. Ere winter set in there came a gracious awakening and at the January communion we saw over sixty join the Church upon many of whom now rests the burden of the work.

The school house question at one time threatened to injure the Church but it was amicably settled, also the two old cemeteries became one.

In 1878 the New York and New Jersey Synod met here. In 1879 Rev. Dr. W. D. Strobel gave a graphic account of the enthusiasm manifested at the General Synod concerning the Woman's work and Pastor Griffith in 1880 reported to Synod "The Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society held its first anniversary on the first Sabbath evening of this month (September) and gave a good report for the year: forty-five members, \$38.96 for home and foreign work, and forty copies of Journal taken." He also reported, "We organized a Young Men's Prayer and Educational Society about a year ago, and they have done a noble work, although few in number."

Rev. J. G. Griffith was born in Bucks county, Pa., Feb. 11, 1839, and ordained at Sunbury in 1868. While pursuing his course at Gettysburg, Pa., during the Civil war, he enlisted in the Pennsylvania Militia, 31st Regiment, Co. D. He answered "Here" to Heaven's roll call from Montoursville, Pa., Dec. 11, 1907.

Rev. John Kling was installed as pastor Nov. 17, 1881, by Revs. G. Neff, D.D., J. A. Earnest, D.D., and S. A. Weikert and left in the spring of 1887. One of many significant events of his pastorate was the organizing

here of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Convention of the New York and New Jersey Synod with Mrs. J. G. Griffith as president, Mrs. Frank Lown recording secretary, and Mrs. A. Allendorf treasurer.

The next pastor was Rev. George W. Fortney who gave seven and one-half years of active service, from Dec. 22, 1887, to May 26, 1895, when he moved to Turbotsville, Pa. He was installed by Revs. C. H. Traver and S. A. Weikert. In August 1890 a Ladies' Aid Society was formed which has in twenty-five years collected \$2000 toward the incidental expenses of the church property.

In the summer of 1892 as preparatory to the entertainment of both Synod and the Woman's Convention, the interior of the church was repapered and painted, the pulpit platform was lowered and a new pulpit placed upon it. The organ and choir were removed from the gallery to the right side of the pulpit. The officers presented a new pulpit Bible. At the re-opening, Aug. 22, 1892, Rev. Dr. Henry Ziegler, father-in-law of the pastor, preached the sermon.

At the 150th anniversary Rev. Fortney wrote me, "I had a reasonably prosperous pastorate during my stay and a very pleasant experience among the people. I shall ever recall my work there with pleasure." He was ordained in 1880 and died at Suffern, N. Y., Aug. 30, 1909. "He possessed a vigorous mind, well disciplined by study and teaching, was a good sermonizer, an acceptable preacher and an ardent advocate of temperance. He was well skilled in music and could lead and drill his church choir."

Rev. Chauncey Diefendorf was pastor from Sept. 1, 1895, to Nov. 27, 1898, when he moved to Lawyersville near Cobleskill, N. Y. He was installed by Rev. Dr. W. H. Luckenbach, president of Synod. Rev. C. H. Traver, D.D., addressed the congregation and Rev. A. E. Dietz, the pastor. He was a devoted and faithful laborer, and won many stars for his crown. He died in his home in Fort Plain, N. Y., Nov. 19, 1909. Rev. Dr. G. U. Wenner, president of Synod, preached the sermon.

Rev. Roscoe C. Wright served as pastor from April 2,

1899, to September 1907. He resigned to accept a call to Amsterdam, N. Y. He was installed May 28, 1899, by Revs. W. W. Gulick, L. D. Wells, D.D., and A. E. Deitz. During his pastorate the church was reroofed, repainted, repapered, lectern added, new organ purchased, also a new furnace and an enlarged kitchen. During his second year, the 17th annual convention of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society was held Oct. 3-5, 1901.

Rev. John Kling was recalled February 1908 and installed April 12 by Rev. L. D. Wells, D.D., acting for the president and giving the charge to the pastor. Rev. D. W. Lawrence addressed the people. His recall after an absence of twenty years was proof of their esteem. His resignation took effect Dec. 1, 1913. He is now serving East Schodack, N. Y., where he accepted a call July 1873, almost 42 years ago. May his strength abide many years to break the Bread of Life to that congregation.

As a student at Hartwick Seminary, N. Y., for six years and a graduate both of the classical and theological departments, William Gibson Boomhower of East Berne, supplied the pulpit occasionally during his last year of study. The congregation extended him a call to begin July 1914, which he accepted provisionally. He was examined and ordained by the Lutheran Synod of New York at Paterson, N. J., Oct. 1, 1914, and installed the same month. He has been very successful in this field. May he see many brought to Christ by his ministry of love and care.

Although this congregation within its history of one hundred fifty years has had the services of sixteen pastors as we have noted, it has given only four in return. Unless others had been more generous, two-thirds of the time should have been vacant. The first was Rev. William Edwin Traver now at the mother Church of the Palatines, East Camp, now Germantown, where he has already served for twenty-two years. It is his fifth pastorate in forty-two years. He attended Hartwick Seminary but owing to an interregnum he pursued his theological course at Gettysburg Seminary and graduated in

June 1873. He has given his whole ministry to this State.

Second, Rev. Chester H. Traver, in his sixth pastorate in forty years, now at Berne, N. Y. He claims Hartwick Seminary, Gettysburg College and Seminary each as Alma Mater.

Third, Rev. John G. Traver, D.D., who at Hartwick Seminary prepared for Gettysburg College and graduated in 1886. He returned to his first Alma Mater and has given twenty-nine years to training scores of our youth who are to-day occupying positions of honor to themselves, their Alma Mater and the Church.

Fourth, Rev. Philip E. Bierbauer, licensed at Amsterdam, N. Y., in September 1897. His first charge was Boulder, Colorado. After twelve years of work he was called to the Muhlenburg Memorial Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

CONCLUSION.

One evening after spending the whole day in research, as a roseate hue spread o'er the western sky, the pen was laid aside for the night. But as I sat at my desk I, in imagination, recalled the past. Again I tramped over old familiar haunts. I saw Jacomintie Fly, Spook-a-bush, and Sipperbark. I entered the homes where appeared the faces of sixty years ago. Troops of fancies filled the mind. Then thought carried me back two hundred years when these hills and valleys were covered with noble forests.

"Here again the Indian war cry rung
Here birds unscared their matins sung
Here beasts unhaunted roamed at will
Through verdured vale or wooded hill."

Here forms of long ago flit like sparks from a camp-fire and then they were lost. Who were they?

What was written about one is applicable to many who were "active, devoted, consistent, zealous members who never shrank from duty, however laborious and self-sacrificing that duty seemed to be." They were "always

at their place in all the meetings of the sanctuary; the storm or ailment must have been very great to have kept them away." They loved their Church. They were happy who could say that when they died they wanted to be missed.

As their leaders in the far shadows, Kocherthal and Falckner, Spanler, Berkenmyer and Hartwick were the counselors of the pioneers and entered the scattered homes as Christ's ambassadors.

A little nearer I saw the log church of 1759. From its pulpit were heard a Reis and Groff, Pfieffer and Quitman, the last the greatest of them all. In the pews were more than could to-day find standing room however closely packed together.

Once more the mind swept aside the ashes and the glow was more intense. Then I saw an Eyer and Geissenhainer, a Smith and Scholl, a Neff and Griffith, a Fortney and Diefendorf springing up to greet us.

Only two, Wright and Kling still preach and may their years of service be many.

The embers died down, the darkness shut me in. And I would conclude in the language of Rev. George Neff, D.D., pastor for twenty-one years, who gave so far as then known the history of this church until the meeting of Conference here in 1872. He wrote "What changes have taken place since these earnest members out of love to the Church of their fathers went heart and hand, soul and body to construct a building where they might worship God in Spirit and in truth. Little did they dream that they were doing a work that would last through all time, imparting rich blessings to their children and their children's children.

Take care of the old church at Wurtemberg, love and attend her court for worship, be interested in all her welfare and reap all the spiritual blessings which through Christ she can impart. Then at the Judgment the fathers and the children of many generations will be gathered and hear the Master say, "Well done good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Berne, N. Y.

ARTICLE V.

A BRIEF STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

The study of Christology involves one of the profoundest subjects of the Bible. The careful Bible student has scarcely had an introduction to this Book of God in Genesis until he is confronted with this great subject. (Gen. 3:15). And from this promise we are led at once into the development of the nature and character of Christ and His work and kingdom by a series of revelations by symbols and divine manifestations. And the more carefully he studies chapter by chapter the more of Christ he finds on every hand. And as he prayerfully peruses its sacred pages, Christ as the One Only Saviour of men comes more conspicuously to the surface. For so Christ spake of Himself, (John 5:39) "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." From the beginning to the end of the Bible it is one continuous tale of the Christ either by prophecy, by symbol or, it may be, by some special personal manifestation of the Pre-incarnate Christ.

The mystery of God's dealings with man will never be fully understood by us in this life. But the mystery of it only serves to impress the more deeply the reality of His wonderful works. God's steps, though mysterious, are none the less real. And with the unbelief of man it sometimes takes the divine hand in mystery to call a halt to human reason and bring forth, as by inspiration, a vision of the real. In all this are manifest the marks of God's goodness and love. And nowhere is this more marked than in the history of God's dealing with His people Israel. To them God was constantly showing Himself in wisdom, love and mercy. And the blindness and inability of the people to see these marks of the divine hand necessitated the more frequent manifestations of

God. The design of these manifestations was two-fold: First, to inspire faith, reverence and Godly fear. For example when God appeared in the mountain enveloped in a cloud of smoke, the people filled with awe and reverence said unto Moses, "Speak thou unto God lest we die." They recognized the divine presence and therefore their reverence and godly fear. A second purpose was to inspire faith and a deeper sense of Christian assurance of divine help and protection. For to Israel a keener sense of the divine presence was a fuller assurance of the divine help and protection. Therefore the presence of the Pillar of the Cloud by day and of Fire by night.

But why these manifestations of the divine presence by symbols and not by a real personal manifestation? That these were manifestations of the Pre-incarnate Christ is generally admitted by unbiased and prayerful students of the Bible. But let us emphasize the fact over and over that what Moses saw as he looked upon the burning bush was not the Pre-incarnate Christ in person but a significant manifestation—a symbol of the work, character and glory of the Christ to come. The nature and character of these manifestations are many and varied. In Genesis 14:17, 18, we read of "Melchizedek, the King of Salem, the Priest of the Most High God." But who was Melchizedek? By reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews (7:1) it is evident that this was the same person who made the covenant with Abraham (see also Gen. 28:12-22). In His interview with Moses He is spoken of as "The Angel of the Lord," and later as God. It was He who later said to Moses, "I am that I am hath sent thee." That is to say the self-existent God hath sent thee.

In Daniel (3:19-25) in the case of the Hebrew youths in the burning fiery furnace when the king Nebuchadnezzar saw a fourth person in the furnace with the youths we read, "And the form of the fourth was like the Son of God." But in following up carefully the cross references it will be found that this was the same person who called to Moses out of the burning bush, that appeared also to

Abraham and Lot in their return from the slaughter of the kings as Melchizedek, and that appeared in the chariot of fire to translate Elijah. Now when Saul of Tarsus, centuries later, on his way to Damascus, was confronted with that wonderful manifestation, and a voice from the midst of the "Great Light" saying unto him, (Acts 9:4, 5) "Saul, Saul! why persecutest thou me?" Saul answered, "Who art thou Lord?" And the answer came promptly, "*I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.*" But a critical analysis of the subject and a careful comparison of the contexts of the Scriptures bearing on the subject brings us to the inevitable conclusion that it was the same person of the Trinity which met Abraham and Lot, and who spoke to Moses out of the burning bush and appeared in "A Chariot of Fire at the translation of Elijah, and who stood by the Hebrew youths in the burning fiery furnace. A careful study therefore of the Christology of the Bible reveals the fact that it was the same person of the Trinity manifested in all these different scenes, only in different forms of manifestation. It was the same Christ of the Bible—"The Lord of Glory."

But we repeat our former question, why not the appearance of Christ in person instead of in these manifestations and symbols? The answer is evident: The public mind was not prepared for the divine presence in person any more than they were prepared for the larger revelations of the deeper things of God's kingdom. It took nearly forty centuries of patient struggle with man on the part of God in the development of His kingdom among men for "The fulness of time" at which the human mind could but very imperfectly grasp the Messianic view of Christ. But God came to His people with His divine presence and revelations as they were prepared to receive both. Hence the old dispensation was one continuous chain of enlarging revelations and operations in the development of God's plan of redemption. It was God's plan to thus lead the human mind from the surface to the center, from the human to the divine, from the symbol to the real, from the temporal to the eternal. But it must all come slowly as the visions of the human could enlarge to comprehend the divine. Hence the necessity

of these marvelous and startling manifestations of Christ to awaken anticipations and to beget visions of the incarnate Christ of the then future.

Hence in our study let us look more carefully:

I. Into Some of These Old Testament Symbols and Study Their Significance.

The scene of the burning bush which confronted Moses as he was leading his father-in-law's flock at the foot of Mount Horeb is worthy of our careful study. We find the record in Exodus 3:1-6.

Let it be noted here that when Moses saw that the bush burned with fire and that it was not consumed, "he turned aside to see this great sight," and "God called unto him out of the midst of the bush." We have therefore:

1. The assurance of a divine presence. "God called unto him out of the midst of the bush." * * * Moreover He said, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." The "Angel of the Lord" spoken of in verse 2 must therefore have been God who "called unto him" in verse 4 and the "I Am That I Am" of verse 14, and "I am the Lord" (6:2) and a "pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night" (13:21) It was God's presence assured.

2. A notable miracle. For "the bush burned with fire but was not consumed."

3. That Moses recognized it as a manifestation of the divine presence. For, "he hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God."

The scene here presented occurred down in the land of Midian, at the foot of Mount Horeb, when Moses was about 80 years of age. The bush which Moses here saw burning was one of those spiked, gnarly, thorny, acacia bushes which were so conspicuous in the "wadies of the desert." At the foothills of Horeb are a series of craggy peaks gradually merging into a great plain. Here amidst this awful desolation the most fertile places of the wilderness are found. It was thither Moses was taking Ruel's flock to pasture and water when he was confronted with the remarkable scene before us. The scene was simple—it was only an acacia bush burning, but nevertheless wonderful in that it was not consumed. It is thus that the

wonders of God are more frequently manifest. The impress of divinity is vested in their simplicity. But what of this remarkable scene as a symbol and what of its significance? And if a divine presence which person of the Trinity is here represented?

That this was no mere idle scene, with no special purpose except to arrest the attention of Moses, is at once evident even to the passing reader. That it had a special significance and meaning was at once evident to Moses. That it was designed to reveal to Moses, and through him to Israel, a special divine presence is likewise evident. But the symbolical reference was not so clearly revealed. But that this scene of the burning bush, the pillar of the Cloud by day and of Fire by night were only different manifestations of the pre-incarnate Christ is generally admitted by our best Bible scholars. And as such the symbolical reference here has clear marks of Christ.

1. As the Light of the World.

When man was not able to look upon the real, God gave him the symbol by which to lead us up in our apprehensions to the real. Moses was afraid when he heard the voice of God out of the bush. Simply the voice from the symbol suddenly converted his curiosity into fear. The symbol itself left the impression of the presence of divinity upon him. Moses could comprehend but little of the reality of what he saw, and still less of its real significance. But God gave him a vision of all that he could grasp. Hence God would lead His people step by step from the darkness of sin and the meager apprehensions of the divine into the larger light of His divine nature and the operations of His Holy Spirit. It must needs have been "line upon line, and precept upon precept." But in every step in the process of unfolding the wonders of God's kingdom among men there was the impress of divinity.

In the creation when all things were ready to need and receive light, "God said, let there be light and there was light." In the symbol of the burning bush we have as the very first appearance just what Moses most needed—"Light." But God had already been eighty years in pre-

paring Moses for this scene as an introduction to larger visions of Him who was to lead the way of Israel in the journey from Egypt to the promised land in a "Pillar of Cloud by day and of Fire by night." But faintly, if at all, did Moses now apprehend the fact that his real leader and guide was the pre-incarnate Christ who centuries later declared (John 8:12), "I am the light of the world: He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Not long after Moses' vision of the burning bush he asked that he might see God. But God knowing that this was more than Moses could comprehend or stand promised him that if he would enter into the cleft of a rock in the top of the mountain He would pass by in a flame of fire and that he might see the hinder part of the flame. But this symbol represented light. It was but the symbol of Him who said, "I am the light of the world." Neither Moses nor his people could comprehend the significance of the symbol, much less look from the symbol to the real. But it was nevertheless a manifestation of the pre-incarnate Christ as "*the light of the world.*" And with each succeeding manifestation of the pre-incarnate Christ there was a larger vision of His marvelous light. When He came to translate Elijah He came "in a chariot of fire, and horses of fire"—both of which were the symbol of light. When He stood by the Hebrew youths in the fiery furnace He appeared to King Nebuchadnezzar as "one like to the Son of God." Truly He was the "Son of God," and by the marvelous light of His revelation became manifest to the King as such. Ah yes! Well did the poet, in the ecstasy of his thought, break forth as by inspiration:

 "Walk in the light! so shalt thou know
 That fellowship of love
His Spirit only can bestow,
 Who reigns in light above.

Walk in the light! and thou shalt own
 Thy darkness passed away,
Because that light on thee hath shone
 In which is perfect day.

Walk in the light! and thine shall be
A path, though thorny, bright;
For God, by grace, shall dwell in thee,
And God Himself is light."

But let us notice now:

2. That the next step in the development of God's kingdom by the symbols of the pre-incarnate Christ is that of "*Power*."

The heathen conception of God was that of strength, might, power. Therefore God would develop the heathen conception of God into the clearer conception of the infinite God—the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—as the God of "*Power*."

We have in the scene of the burning bush not only the display of the power of manifestation, but more also—the power to control the laws of nature. The bush burned, but it was not consumed. The pre-incarnate Christ now began to reveal Himself not only as infinite in "*Light*," but in "*Power*" as well. Hence He stayed the fire from consuming; He transformed His appearance (at will) from the burning bush to a "Pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night." He thus assured His people of safety by day and of light and protection by night. And when the infidel Pharaoh obstinately refused submission to God's demands to release His people God's omnipotent hand dealt out to him the ten plagues. And when in his wrath he followed Israel to recapture them the same pre-incarnate Christ communicated power to His servant Moses to part the waters of the sea, to dry the path for Israel through the bed of the sea, and to bury the host of Pharaoh under the waters of the sea. It was the same pre-incarnate Christ which covered the mountain with smoke and caused its base to tremble under the roll of thunder and the lightning to flash as Moses was about to enter. It was the omnipotent hand of Him who fed Israel with mana in the desert, who centuries later pronounced Himself the "Bread of Life." It was the same omnipotent hand of Him who buried His servant Moses in an unknown spot on Nebo's brow, and centuries later brought

him forth as a witness of His transfiguration. (Matt. 17: 1-8). It was His omnipotent hand which caused fire to fall from heaven to consume the God-forsaken Sodom, and later, in answer to Elijah's prayer, to fall upon his sacrifice and consume it and lick up the water in the trenches about it. It was He who closed the lion's mouth for Daniel, and guarded the Hebrew youths against the flames in the fiery furnace. And it was He who at length, as He expired on the cross rent the veil of the temple in twain from the top to the bottom and caused the sleeping dead to come forth from their tombs. Yes! What Moses saw was a symbol, but in it was the real—the omnipotent Christ—the Son of God. God would thus develop the conception of the omnipotent Christ to come in the mind of His people Israel.

But if God would thus develop the conceptions of His ancient people into visions of the omnipotent Christ what effect should a careful study of this great subject have upon our minds? Have we gotten real visions of an omnipotent Saviour—one who is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by Him? If so then we may well sing with all our hearts:

“All hail the power of Jesus' name
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all.”

But let us note:

3. That the next step in the development of God's kingdom by the pre-incarnate Christ was unto holiness and splendor.

As Moses approached the burning bush he heard a voice from the bush saying, “Moses, Moses * * * draw not nigh hither; put off the shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is *holy ground*.” Under this vision of God a little later he cried from the depth of his heart, (Ex. 15:11) “Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like unto thee. glorious in *holiness*, *fearful in praises*, *doing wonders*,” And so deeply was

he impressed with this vision of the *holiness* of God that in preparing the vestments for the priests he ordered a plate of pure gold placed on the mitre with this inscription, "HOLINESS TO THE LORD." (Ex. 28:36).

And thus ever and anon the impress of holiness and glory was made at every step upon the mind of God's people. From the awful stillness of the lonely place of this burning bush God spake unto Moses. And the very first impression was holiness. And later when he ascended into the mountain enveloped with the cloud of smoke to be alone with God, a still deeper impress of the holiness of God and His kingdom was made upon the mind of Moses. And as the people saw the mountain veiled under the cloud, and heard the voice of thunder, and felt the earth tremble under the power of God they said unto Moses, (Ex. 20:19) "Speak thou with us and we will hear; but let not God speak with us lest we die." If such was the awful impression upon the mind of God's ancient people of the presence of God in holiness what must be the awful sensation of the wicked in the presence of God in His holiness! But we are studying the *holiness* of the pre-incarnate Christ who, in the last great day, shall sit upon the throne of judgment. But how different as we, whose souls have been lightened with His presence and quickened by His Holy Spirit, shall stand before Him in the peace of holiness!

But as we think of the august presence of God in holiness as thus presented in these manifestations of the pre-incarnate Christ our minds just as naturally get visions of the splendor and glory of "The Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," as with His power and holiness. Think of Jacob's vision of the ladder (Gen. 28:12-15) the top of which reached unto heaven with the angels of God ascending and descending upon it: Is it any wonder that as Jacob awoke from his sleep he exclaimed, "surely the Lord is in this place,* * * this is none other than the house of God." Is it any wonder that Elisha gave expression to the ecstasy of his soul as he beheld the pre-incarnate Christ in the appearance of "The Chariot of fire and the horses of fire" descending

from heaven and, taking up Elijah, return in glory and splendor into heaven as he exclaimed, "My Father! My Father! The Chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" (2 K. 2:12). But this was only a symbol of the royalty of Jesus Christ, as the former—the vision of the ladder—was a symbol of the mediatorial work of Christ. Or is it any wonder that Noah, when leaving the Ark, and after his sacrifice unto the Lord he beheld the glory of God's rain-bow spanning the firmament of heaven from horizon to horizon as a covenant of universal peace and joy, he went forth more than rewarded for his patient service of one hundred and twenty years of preaching and preparing the ark. It did not take the Queen of Sheba long to form an estimate of the glory and splendor of the Temple and Palace of Solomon, and in the exuberance of her joy she exclaimed, "behold the half hath not been told." But Solomon's temple and palace were only symbols looking from the light, and power, and glory of the temporal to that of the future—to the eternal.

But from our study of some of these Old Testament symbols and their significance let us turn to note:

II. That with these several manifestations of the pre-incarnate Christ there has come a chain of enlarging visions of His divinity.

While God was developing hope and expectation in the minds of His people of a coming Christ by these various manifestations, back of the display of His light and power and glory there was a strange but inevitable impress of divinity. No sooner had God informed Moses out of the midst of the burning bush who He was than we read, "And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God." After Jacob had his vision of the ladder and awaked out of his sleep, he said, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not; and he was afraid and said, how dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God; and this is the gate to heaven." And later when he had wrestled all night with the pre-incarnate Christ, and received the blessing he craved, "he called the name of that place Peniel. For I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved."

After the three Hebrew youths had been cast into the fiery furnace (Dan. 3:21-26) Nebuchadnezzar, the King, was astonished to see a fourth person and "said unto his counsellors, did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the *fourth is like the Son of God.*"

From the many like scenes in the Old Testament we have selected but these few to serve our purpose. Just why and how God left these unmistakable impressions of divinity in each one of these symbolic appearances we can not now take space to discuss. But two things are evident: First, that it was the pre-incarnate Christ as the person recognized in each scene. And second, that in each case there was a recognition of a divine presence. There can therefore be but one conclusion; namely, that God was developing in the minds of His people conceptions of the divinity of Christ as rapidly as they could, even in the most vague and imperfect way, apprehend this profound truth. Neither Moses, nor Jacob, no, nor the wicked king Nebuchadnezzar could refrain from giving expression to their deepest convictions of the divine presence.

But with so much of Christ and His divinity revealed in the Old Testament let us inquire:

III. What logical deductions can we make from this study for present day thought?

God's kingdom has always presented itself to the unbiased and thoughtful student as one of wonders and mysteries. And as we stop and ponder thoughtfully over the wonders of God's dealings with man, our thoughts persistently grapple with the new and as yet unfathomed depths of truth. The thoughtful student has ever been on the alert for a stepping stone from which to take a higher flight into the realm of the unknown, or for a gateway to some mine of as yet undiscovered truth. Thus God, in His Word and in His dealings with mankind, has constantly incited a craving in the human mind for a

deeper insight into His wonders and mysteries with each step in life. As with the first vision of a mammoth panorama, there is a persistent peering into the future with the almost unconscious mental query, "What next?" And the more we peer into the things of the kingdom of God the more wonderful it seems to us, and the more completely we stand dumfounded at the as yet undiscovered truths. But what clearer marks of divinity could be desired than these incomprehensible truths with which we are thus confronted on every hand? But all this has served only to whet the intellectual appetite of men for the profounder things of God's kingdom. Hence the propriety of the question just raised, What logical deductions can we make from this study for present day thought?

Time and space permit us to suggest but few of these:

1. That the subject of Christology is not a modern innovation upon modern theological thought. But from the time of God's covenant with Abraham there has been a continuous chain of the "Unfolding Christ." When his meeting with Melchizedek was yet fresh in Abraham's mind the same pre-incarnate Christ came as his guest with the promise to him and Sarah, his wife, of a son Isaac, and immediately passed on to visit judgment (Genesis 18:-) upon the wicked city of Sodom. Thus God would continue these lessons on the Christology of the Bible in quick succession. The subject is therefore well nigh as old as the promise of a coming Christ. But from this we advance just a step to emphasize the fact:

2. That God purposely and wisely developed the doctrine of the divinity of Christ in the minds of His people with the development of His plan of redemption. There was in the development of the plan of redemption a simultaneous development of the attributes, offices and work of the Christ to come, so that at the advent of Christ the people might have understood His nature and mission far better but for the blindness from their sin of unbelief and consequent disobedience and rebellion. But the thoughtful and prayerful student of the present is not wholly dependent upon New Testament statements and revelation for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

But you will observe:

3. That a careful critical study of the Christ of the Old Testament leads us to see in the Christ of light, and power, and glory an all-sufficient Saviour for all mankind. (See Isaiah 43:1-7). For as "God so loved the world" so He also prepared a plan of salvation for as many as would accept of Him in love.

Wellington, Kansas.

ARTICLE VI.

LUTHERAN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE.¹

BY FREDERICK G. DEMPWOLF.

The object of writing this paper on "Lutheran Church Architecture" is to endeavor to bring before you the more salient features and possibilities of this inspiring subject. Of course you will appreciate that in so short a period of time, and without the means of views my treatment of it, is of necessity more of an outline than a finished exposition.

That there is at present throughout our country a wide spread inquiry regarding the architectural design of the Church there can be no doubt. This is true not only in our Lutheran Churches but in practically all of the other denominations. Wherever church architecture is under discussion one hears such phrases as "Churchly Churches," "Ecclesiastical Atmosphere," &c., phrases which forty years ago would most certainly have put an architect beyond the pale of any Protestant Building Committee.

In order to explain this transition which has come, let me briefly trace for you the history of church art, and show you that after all it is a logical transition, and one to be naturally expected after the chaotic conditions through which church architecture passed in this country.

Since the beginning of recorded history art has existed in varying degrees of nobility, but no period has ever come during which it has been essentially wrong, not even the last years of the Roman Empire, or the dark ages of Europe, no period I say, until the last half of the 19th century. Europe was not much better off, but there was a sufficient difference as shown by her exhibits at our Centennial to give us a vigorous shock; and almost at once, we here in America set ourselves to the task of creating

1 An address delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

the art that was then considered only one of the amenities of civilization. We did not succeed in making it instinctive, but we learned much and began a course of imitation that was often intelligent at least. In fact trained specialists succeeded in giving us, with infinite labor, what a common workman would have done, without thought, three or four centuries ago.

All true art is of necessity instinctive, never imitative. Hence you can see that this movement nearly gave the death blow to our architectural inspiration, civil as well as ecclesiastical. It became the fashion to affect the splendors of elaborate architectural form. Style followed upon style as fashions changed until we had truly a confusion of tongues. Did the Church in her many denominations stand aloof from all this? No indeed, every newly discovered style found favor in her eyes and hence we see throughout the length and breadth of our country churches showing all the artificiality that was at the same time peculiar to our secular life.

Art in all its forms owes its inspiration to religion, from the masterful pagan temples of Egypt and Greece with all their correlated sculpture and painting to the awe-inspiring cathedrals with all their artistic accessories of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. Art could never have existed without religion. Nor is there any reason to suppose that there would have been any change, had the Reformation restricted itself to internal reforms and not insisted upon revolution and disruption with such baneful effects upon the ecclesiastic architecture of Europe.

In this respect the Lutheran Church in Germany was more fortunate. For, according to Dr. Mothes in his handbook of Evangelical Christian Church Building, "Luther did not and the Evangelical Church neither can nor will cast to one side the tradition of the Christian Church, but they would cleanse it from the human opinions, and the abuses which have formed upon it in the course of time; and they demand the same purification of ecclesiastical art and architecture." Therefore it is our heritage and privilege to maintain and use all those symbols

and artistic features of the Roman Church, which are not pernicious to Lutheran faith and teachings. Martin Luther himself adhered more closely to the doctrine and sacraments, and in the outward organization and usages to the Roman Church than either Zwingli or Calvin. Hence we find that the Lutheran Churches of Germany, particularly those built three and four hundred years ago have indeed an ecclesiastic atmosphere and are truly churchly. Therefore it is quite evident that it is the basic principles of these that we must study if we would produce in this country a vital, modern, consistent Lutheran Church Architecture.

Let us now consider what the fundamental reasons and requisites of church building are and in their order of importance:

In the first place, a church is a house of God, a place of His earthly habitation. From the day when God revealed to Solomon the plan and fashion of the temple down to those wherein our forefathers spent to the utmost their scanty means, and toiled with devout hands to build the awe-inspiring mediaeval cathedrals and abbeys, this thought has always been uppermost in their minds. They were indeed building a house of God, and the treasure and labor expended on it was consecrated in a fashion as it never could be in any other structure. All the wonders of art, all the treasures gathered from many lands, were at the disposal of the builders, and were lavished here in gratitude and thanksgiving. Nothing was too precious. Their faith and enthusiasm made the impossible possible. Indeed they were constantly haunted with the idea that their materials and labor failed to show their deep devotion and their realization of the majesty of that Presence that should enter and dwell within their church.

What relationship can we find between this truly religious spirit and that which still prompts and governs the construction of our contemporary church? If it existed in only a small degree men would understand more clearly the fatal error of the modern principle of building. They would realize that no tricks in construction, no imitations,

no cheapness, no pretences of any kind are tolerable in a Christian Church, and that the admission of these things into the house of the Living God is indeed the admission of lack of reverence or fear. Instead of the cheap and tawdry structures of shingles and clap boards, flimsy brick and stone veneering, doomed to indeed a very desirable decay, we should have once more solid and enduring churches, that even if they cannot compare with the noble work of the Middle Ages would at least stand with it in point of honor, instead of being, as now a perpetual reminder of our meanness and our hypocrisy. This therefore is the first reason, and the highest reason for church building.

The second is the providing of a place apart where may be solemnized our beliefs and our faith, namely the Sanctuary. Here should be concentrated all the wealth of loving workmanship that may be obtained through years of personal sacrifice. Previous to the 16th century the churches of Europe were stupendous treasure houses, in which every jewel and statue and picture, every bit of metal work and carving and embroidery, voiced some personal devotion, some gratitude of man for mercies and blessings. This was indeed a period showing true religious spirit. Then came the Reformation attended with all the various uprisings and miseries of the people. You all know the fate of England and her ecclesiastical art at the hands of Cromwell. Germany was indeed fortunate to escape, with but minor uprisings of the peasants leading to the peasants' war. This uprising put the Church more firmly in the hands of the ruling princes and tended to give its monuments a protection which they failed to receive in many of the other European countries. Yet with all the conservativeness that from this time on surrounded the Lutheran Church in Germany we find upon examining our churches in this country that that religious spirit which inspired our ancestors there to work for their Church, was lost over here. Our Lutheran Church Buildings fell heir to the same distressful conditions of design, arrangement and construction, that were prevalent in all the other denominations, and con-

sequently a few decades ago a design which may have suited a Presbyterian or Methodist congregation seemed perfectly satisfactory for a Lutheran Church.

There is no need to argue for the importance of this religious spirit. Instinct, conscience and a seemingly natural impulse all urge us to glorify the sanctuary of our Lord. It seems incredible that during the constructive period of our Church in this country this eminently fundamental law of church building should have been so obscured until men should through sheer ignorance build auditoriums and show structures totally unsuited for the proper conducting of our church ritual and service. But thanks to study which trained architects have been carrying on in conjunction with clergymen who appreciate that art is the hand maiden of religion, we now have some notable sanctuaries in many of our Lutheran Churches that recall the spirit of the past, and show us that the faith that was the inspiration of those times still obtains, and remains serene above the vacillations and vicissitudes of human society.

The third aspect of church architecture it seems to me is: the creation of spiritual emotion through the ministry of all possible beauty of environment; the using of art to lift men's minds from the secular to the spiritual. The agency of art to this end is immeasurable and from time immemorial until the iconoclastic period this fact was always recognized. Surely not in the barren meeting house of the Puritans, with its white-washed walls, three-decker pulpit, and box pews were men readily lifted out of themselves into a spiritual communion with God; not there did they come to know clearly and distinctly the Charity and Sweetness of Christianity and the solemnity of divine worship, but where they were surrounded by the dim shadows; where lofty clustered columns of stones died out, high overhead, into sweeping arches and shadowy vaults; where golden rays of light shot down through storied windows, painted with the benign faces of saints and angels; where the eye rested at every turn on a painted or carven Bible manifesting itself through the senses to the imagination; where every wall, every

foot of floor space bore its silent memorial to the dead, its thank offering to God; where was always the still atmosphere of prayer and praise.

It was the fashion in a would-be Spartan generation, to scorn all these artistic adjuncts as superstitious and idolatrous; but the attempt to succeed without this aid was not crowned with great success. Art has been, is and will be the greatest agency for spiritual impression that the Church may claim, despite ancient and modern iconoclasts. It is thus here, in all her many branches of painting, sculpture and music and architecture, that religion finds its fullest expression and its most potent incentive. But we must remember that spiritual and divine art come only when the religious spirit is dominant and supreme.

Let us abandon our parsimonious giving; let us forsake our flimsy temporary style of architecture, and build once more churches that, by reason of their massive stability, richness, splendor, and voiceful pictures on their walls and windows, shall show forth to men the sublimity of our faith, satisfy their stifled cravings for art and beauty, and lift them into the exaltation of spiritual conviction. By so doing we shall certainly see a more speedy restoration and universal acceptance of Christianity.

This is one of the most important aspects of church architecture, and it certainly is the one most recklessly and universally ignored.

The fourth aspect of Church Building is the one which is generally considered exclusively, namely the arrangement of a building for the comfort of the congregation. I do not mean for an instant that this quality must be sacrificed to the others: a church if it is properly designed will fulfill at once the requirements of to-day, that it be a perfect sanctuary, a perfect temple, a perfect auditorium. I protest only against that custom of refusing to consider a plan that shows a single seat behind a column, a nave, longer than it is wide, or that does not provide a picture gallery light during the day and the illumination of a theatre by night.

Having viewed the four most important aspects of

Church Building, let us now turn our attention toward the application of these ancient and eternal principles to the various phases of ecclesiastical architecture that we are now called upon to build, from the small country chapel to the imposing city church with all of its adjuncts.

We have seen some of the errors of which we have been guilty in our Church Building, and we have also observed the motives and artistic dogmas that are the fundamentals of ecclesiastic architecture. Turning now to our own epoch, let us bear this in mind: when we build here in America, we are building for now, we are manifesting the living Church. It is art, not archaeology, that drives us. *From the past, not in the past.* We must return for the fire of life to other centuries, but we may not remain. It is the present that demands us. We must express the Church that is one through all ages; but we must also express the endless changes of human life, the variation of environment, the eternal through the never fixed. This is church architecture of to-day, and this problem presents itself with equal insistence in the most complex structures of the Church, or in the simplest country chapel or mission. No matter how small the latter may be or how inexpensive or simple in design, they are yet churches; and in the least of them one should be able to read as clearly the nature of the power that brought it into existence as in the greatest.

The country chapel is a great and unsolved problem so far as we in America are concerned. Perhaps the Building Committee does not think it worth while to employ an architect when so little money is to be spent; perhaps a vestryman knows a deserving young man who is a draughtsman in so and so's office, and will furnish the drawings at half price. Whatever the cause, the effect is conspicuous, and the country chapel, the kind that costs between \$5000.00 and \$10,000.00 and seats from 100 to 200 people, is almost without exception horrible in the extreme. Were it frankly rough and barbarous, a frontier log cabin, it would at least be honorable; but it is not this. It is flimsy in construction and wholly bad in shape

and composition, and to make it still worse, it is made mean and contemptible by its impossible ornamentation. Even where it is a perfectly square box with a steep pitched roof, it becomes revolting, through the use of arched windows, foolish wooden buttresses that support nothing, and futile belfries and pinnacles. Let us hope that with this generation the fantastic, chaotic, would-be picturesque type, that owes its existence to shingles, wood stain, cheap colored glass, and the so-called "Art-movement," will pass forever. Fortunately, their very flimsiness of materials will not allow them to last much longer. But it is against repetition of such work that we must constantly be on our guard.

There is just one way to build a country chapel and that is to build it as simply as possible and of as durable materials as may be obtained. The result may be bald and ugly, but surely ugliness is better than impudence. Therefore our problem has resolved itself into building a shelter for the altar and congregation, together with such adjuncts as are necessary, for the smallest cost consistent with honesty, durability, dignity and reverence.

Let us now consider the interior arrangement or plan. In a church or chapel of this size, the chancel is solely for the altar and minister. This does not mean that a little recess is enough. More space is necessary than is actually demanded by the function of the sanctuary, for there must be a due proportion between the nave and chancel. If we cannot obtain dignity through size, we can through relation. Therefore the chancel should be deep, even if narrow. It should not be divided from the nave by a screen which properly belongs only in a large Church. A chancel parapet of plain wooden panels with a heavy rood-beam above, carrying a cross, is the best indication of the transition from nave to sanctuary. Needless to say a transept in such a small church is entirely out of place, as it belongs in a church of great length and height.

The arrangement of the chancel should be very simple. The Altar of course being central at the end of the main axis of the church dominates the whole arrangement. It

is the place of direct communion with God in the Sacrament and in prayer. The pulpit and lectern should be in organic relation to it; and all must be so arranged that the minister at the altar, in the pulpit or at the lectern, will be visible and intelligible from the nave of the church. In order to accomplish this it is best to elevate the floor of the chancel three steps above the floor of the church, the steps running across the entire width of the chancel. The pulpit and lectern stand upon this platform. This platform should be of generous depth, at least seven feet. The pulpit on the epistle side and the lectern on the gospel side. Directly behind these should be the communion rail. It should be elevated one step above the chancel floor. In a truly Lutheran Church it should have only side arms and not extend across the front, as this tends to cut off a view of the altar from the congregation. Within the railing, space must be allowed for the minister to administer the communion. The altar should be raised one step above the platform of the communion rail. This step, known as the foot pace, should be about 3 feet wide so that the minister can readily turn about on it. By adhering to this arrangement, which raises the altar five steps in all above the floor or nave of the church, we find that we have obtained an elevation, which makes the altar the most prominent fixed feature of the church, and yet places the communion rail within easy access of the communicant. The shape of the sanctuary should be square, not polygonal or semi-circular. These latter forms are dangerous and but seldom used to good effect except in cathedrals or churches of great size. In a small church they are inevitably mean and trivial in effect. The lighting of the chancel should be from high windows on one or both sides. In so small a structure a window over the altar is hardly advisable, for in order to give the altar its due prominence, as the center and concentration of the church, it should have at least a low reredos. In a lofty church there is room for both, a reredos and windows. Of course these windows must always be sufficiently high from the chancel floor so as not to allow the bright eastern light to shine into the eyes of

the congregation. Moreover as in a church of this size the choir is not placed in the chancel, it is well to keep this part of the structure in a dimmer light than the nave, as we thereby add a touch of mystery that comes from shadow in the sanctuary. Needless to say a skylight in the roof, or any lighting such as dormer windows is entirely out of place, and will absolutely destroy every particle of architectural effect or religious inspiration.

The size of the nave is determined by the number of sittings required, but the question of proportion is still a very important matter. The longer and narrower it is, so much the better are its acoustics, appearance and economy of construction. It is easy to span a distance of twenty-five feet, but double that width is three times as costly. Of course the nave should be divided by a central aisle sufficiently wide for all ceremonies,—about four and one-half feet wide is the minimum,—leading from the rear of the church up to the communion rail, which as I have noted above, is open at least the full width of the altar.

The side walls should be kept as high as possible with due regard to the proportion of the interior and to cost. By doing this it is then possible to keep the sills of the windows well above the floor and this is most desirable as it gives the most effective lighting. If the church is properly orientated, by that I mean with its sanctuary to the east and the congregation facing in that direction, then the west window should be a large one and well above the heads of the audience, if possible, so as to throw the light in long slanting rays toward the chancel and sanctuary.

The arrangement of the choir space in a church of this size is somewhat difficult as we have no fixed precedent for its location. The old fashioned scheme of mixed choir and organ in a small gallery at the west end of the church below the large window is good. However it is not very popular with us for some reason or other, probably because there has grown up among us an idea that we should be able to see the action of each singer. Of course this feature is not important. To hear them is sufficient. Dr. Horn rightly says: "Singing for enter-

tainment or display is out of place in a church." But with our service, requiring the organist and choir to be in perfect accord with the minister, it seems as though the best arrangement in this size of a church is a choir space opening either into the chancel itself, or into the nave. In either case there should be access to this choir-space from outside, so that the singers and organist need not pass through the congregation in taking their places. There is no doubt that in the majority of Lutheran Churches in this country the choir-space has been allotted too important a position, whereby the prominence of the singers tends to divert the congregation's attention from the sanctuary.

The cost of course is the limiting quality with regard to style and architectural design, yet economy need not mean inferiority. If the law followed is that of perfect simplicity we cannot go far wrong. The roof line should be simple, unbroken from end to end. Complicated roofs spoil all repose and dignity. A tower is fatal unless it can be large enough to be respectable. Therefore it is better to put the money that would go into the tower into the church proper. Towers can always be added afterward.

"We can not hope to rival the little churches in England and Germany in this day and generation, for conditions absolutely prevent the hearty lavishing of labor that was characteristic of the Middle Ages. We cannot restore the externals of the Gothic style, but we can endeavor to recreate the underlying spirit and lead it to express itself in the new forms we must impose on it." We can begin by building in stone not in wood, for though it costs more at first it is permanent and respectful. Almost any local ledge-stone will serve if it has a fairly even face. Field stones should never be used under any circumstances. A wall must have unity and coherence, if it lacks these qualities it is not a wall. Round face stones absolutely prevent these results. Where stone is out of the question brick should be used, provided it is a common red brick with a rough surface and is laid up in common mortar. Fancy brick should certainly be avoided.

In the matter of interior treatment the law of simplicity and reserve holds equally good. As stone or brick for the interior walls would be too costly in so small a church, a plain plaster finish is the only alternative. The roof for reasons of acoustics and honesty and cheapness of construction should be of wood. If the trusses and sheathing are dressed and all stained a dark brown, with a dull finished surface, we have obtained the best that can be expected of us.

The question of stained glass is of course important, but let me say, that unless figure windows done by the best of talent are assured, it is far better to use plain cathedral glass, in a soft warm color, cut in diamond shaped pattern, set in heavy lead. We should not attempt to deceive ourselves or others with false effect in poor glass.

All the richness and cost in the furniture should be lavished on the altar, which if consistent with the style of the church, may be quite elaborate. The pulpit and lectern should be simple. Avoid the lacquered brass lecterns, as they are in exceedingly bad taste, as they outshine the altar. The altar should be long, even in very small churches seven feet is not too great a length. The communion rail should be very simple. Here again the fancy brass work is entirely out of place. This railing looks best in wood, matching in color that of the pulpit and lectern. One thing well to remember, particularly in small churches, is that the lighting at night should be from the side, not from centre chandeliers, since these are dazzling and conflict with the altar. The study of indirect lighting, especially for a church, is only in its infancy. However this treatment when satisfactorily developed will I believe be a great factor in the illumination of our churches.

Some times there is not enough money available for a church of the roughest stone, and wood is the only material that can be used. Where this is the case, as in small mission churches, it is better to treat the new building frankly as a temporary structure, built to last only until a real church can be erected. It is foolish to waste a dollar on such a structure as this, and it is bet-

ter to spend no more than what will barely suffice to make a shelter. "The worship of God can be conducted in a barn, but we should not build flimsy wooden shanties to His glory and try to deceive Him with the cheap ornament wherewith we hoodwink our neighbors." If it is worth while building a church, it is worth while building it well; and if this generation has not the funds, then let the actual building wait for the next.

Our sense of economy forbids us making a church any larger than is necessary. Therefore we are denied all the facile means displayed by our ancient examples in obtaining grandeur by having lofty stone piers and high roofs and deep chancels. Consequently we must do the best we can without them and though the task is harder, it is not beyond the powers of our achievement. With study and seriousness of purpose we can build small churches, that shall be as religious, and as worthy in their degree, as the largest and most perfect ecclesiastic edifices, and this is our absolute duty.

Reduced to a few sentences is not this the law of church building as applied to chapels and small country churches? Build in stone or brick. Plan with rigid simplicity, design both exterior and interior with reserve and formality. Have the mass simple. Imitate no form or detail of larger structures, but work for the dignity and reverence, that are peculiar to them. Above all let the spirit of the building be that of the unchanging church, the form alone that of the present day.

Having considered the general conditions that should govern our smaller churches, let us now consider the various phases of a larger church suitable for our small cities and towns. It becomes evident at once, that all those principles that apply to the smaller church maintain in the larger one. In order to build the church rightly it is necessary to do and observe three things: first to build in the only style that we have any right to, and that has any kin to our original mother church; second to select an architect who believes in the church and sympathizes with her, who understands Gothic as a living, not an historic style, and then to rely on him im-

plicitly; third to build a little now, and build it right, instead of trying to build a great deal, and as a result building it meanly.

It is hardly necessary to prove that Gothic is the one style in which we should work. This is generally admitted, but "Gothic" as a term has not as yet differentiated itself. Too often it means anything done in Europe during the 13th and 16th centuries. Hence we have buildings that try to appear in detail at least, of some particular land or time. This is archaeology not architecture. If we are to build honorably we must take up the life of church building when it was a living vital force, and continue from that point, adding what we will so long as we assimilate it. But the root of it all must be Gothic of the late 15th and early 16th centuries.

The selection of an architect is quite as important a matter as the restriction of style. There are scores of really great architects in America, but there are very few who feel Gothic, who by diligent study understand its spirit, and can therefore work in it as church architecture demands that they should. There are many who can copy a certain German or English tower intelligently, who can draw accurate 13th or 14th century mouldings, and admire good Gothic work in general. But these are not available men if we are to incorporate the old religious spirit, and build living churches.

Finally after the architect has been selected come the instructions from the Building Committee. "There shall be no east window, we don't like the light in that place." "No, we can't have columns obstructing the view of the pulpit." "Those windows are too high, we must have lower ones." "What! a \$40,000.00 church without a transept and a polygonal chancel, and a rose window in the front gable!" "Absurd, we must have all these things, by all means." This is hardly the way to build a good church. An architect should have been chosen by the Building Committee, in whom they could place implicit trust, and once chosen, his decision on such points of design, as well as of materials and methods should be final. His knowledge on the subject has taken him years

of toil and study to obtain, whereas a Building Committee rarely builds more than one church during their life time.

You have observed that I said in order to build right it is better to build a little than to attempt "scimp" on everything. Suppose that a congregation has \$30,000.00 to spend on a church seating about 350 people. The tendency is to try to get this structure complete, down to the last square foot of carpet, within that price. To do this, everything has to be as cheap as possible. The walls of the poorest stone work, no cut stone mouldings at the entrance or windows, the tracery in the same of wood, and the floor as well, the furniture thin, plain and undignified, the whole design, small unimposing and poor. Twenty-five years later the structure is outgrown and very shabby in appearance. Then it is torn down, and the \$30,000.00 practically lost or else twice that sum is expended in unavailing attempts to rejuvenate it, and give it a semblance of dignity. How much better it would have been had the money originally been devoted to building a part of a thoroughly designed church. Say the bare walls and roof, putting all the stonework for ornamentation in place but leaving it for future carving. The tower and reredos and chancel woodwork could have all been temporarily left off and the church, bare and awkward if you like, would yet have been permanent, honorable and right as far as it went. There would also have been the incentive for the congregation to put forth great effort to finish it, and men realizing its permanence would be encouraged in adding some bit of carving, some window, some statue. It would have been a building with a history, and with constantly growing associations. It would have been a living thing, a monument growing and developing from year to year, becoming ever more glorious and more beautiful.

This is the proper way to design the living church, a thing which should grow from year to year, never quite perfect, never quite finished.

In plan this size of a church, suitable for our smaller cities, should again be long and narrow, for the same rea-

son as given for this shape, under the description of country churches. The walls of the nave should be high, with possibly low side aisles. The nave wall in this case supported on arches and columns. These columns occurring in the side aisles do not obstruct the view of a single person. The choir in this church may well be incorporated in the chancel, half on one side, half on the other. The chancel of course is proportionally deeper, when the choir is so placed. In this size of a church and in the larger city churches this seems to be the best location for the choir. The new Lutheran Church at Akron, Ohio, has the choir in this space.

The entire sanctuary must again be in proportion to the size of the church. And let me urge that it be as deep as possible. Herein lies the majesty of our ancient examples.

Again with regard to the nave, of course the main aisle is the central one. A church with three aisles, one in the centre and one on each side between the wall and pews is the best arrangement of aisles and seating. The prejudice against columns that cut off a direct view of pulpit or altar from a few seats in the aisles, does not seem based upon reason. Their omission with the superimposed arches destroys a just sense of the proportion of the interior, particularly in a large church. Then too, have we not the best of precedents for them in our best examples? A little reason will show that it is absurd to sacrifice every question of dignity and proportion for the sake of what is in reality a prejudice.

I am sorry that I have no slides with me, whereby I could illustrate the various points I have brought up. If I had I would most assuredly show you several plans typically Lutheran, showing the ideal arrangement of nave, chancel and sanctuary. I could also point out the various technical points, such as size and contour of piers with spacing, the nature of Gothic arches, and their use, the size of windows with reference to light and to giving a sense of proportion, and the design of the tracery therein.

However these are technical and you know it is impos-

sible within the province of one lecture, to lay down a full set of rules whereby any architect or even layman may design a church to suit himself. It was rather my intention to indicate the general principles that govern church architecture, and their application to-day.

The small city church is an admirable problem, as the limitations of land are rarely as hampering as in the larger cities. It stands midway between the country chapel verging on its design and materials and roughness, and the city church with its necessary formality and stateliness.

Turning our attention now to this aspect of church building, the large city church, we find we are confronted with probably the most essentially modern conditions. For in this type of Christian architecture we are called upon to prove its extreme adaptability and vitality by fitting it to newer conditions without losing any of its historical and spiritual qualities.

In the great periods of church building the city was but an exaggerated village, as far as its physical aspect was concerned. The streets were winding and irregular and land had not reached that tremendous valuation that to-day makes each square foot of almost incalculable cost.

The modern city with its straight, uninteresting streets, its towering structures, its dull blocks of houses and shops demands other methods of design, where religious edifices are concerned. It must adapt itself to new conditions, conform in a measure to its environment. Yet this has been almost entirely overlooked by architects of the present day and as a consequence we find churches with low walls, slender spires and other features of design perfectly suited to the country or village church, set down in the immediate vicinity of blocks of dwellings or mercantile buildings that rise absurdly above them, crushing them into ignomy, making its towers that do not rise above the neighboring cornices, simply laughable.

Therefore when a church is to be built in a city on a site already surrounded by lofty buildings, it is only right and proper that the walls of the nave must be increased

in height. It does no good to build a low church and then try to lift it into dominance by means of a lofty spire. And there is no doubt that the church should dominate its immediate neighborhood. It is far better in a city to do away with the tower completely and put that money into increasing the height of the walls of the nave.

Of course in all fundamental particulars church building in the city is identical to church building in the country. The same laws of style, planning and composition hold good. The necessary modifications are economy of space. In detail there must be no rudeness, allowable in the country chapel. The material must be dressed stone or brick. Ornamentation must be carefully cut and placed. Everything must be refined, restrained, formal, both inside and out.

I have before spoken of the prime necessity of rigid honesty in all church building, where any wilful falsity approaches the point of sacrilege. False construction is simply a lie told for reasons of penury or ostentation. There has been altogether too much of this sort of thing, imitation-stone, mosaic, stained glass and marble, all of which are unpardonable in church building.

We may study the monuments of the past until we are surfeited with erudition. We may measure and sketch and photograph the work of the middle ages until we could almost reconstruct any given monument. We may try to build with archaeological exactness, and in this we may succeed, but we may as well understand at once, that we study and labor in vain, unless we realize that beauty of any kind, in any church, is put there to the glory of God, and not to the admiration of the passers-by.

Good architecture, perfect art, are not matters of pride: they are not desirable because they flatter the feelings of a certain congregation, but because they show a right impelling spirit, because they are indeed "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," and because in their perfection they are the least unworthy of the material treasures of this life, that may be offered in the worship of God.

York, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SPIRIT OF JESUS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS.¹

BY GAIUS GLENN ATKINS.

The hope of any real betterment in our civilization rests in the final supremacy of the Spirit of Jesus in diplomacy, statecraft and all points of international contact. Long ago Jesus issued His ultimatum when He said, speaking out of the fulness of His divine consciousness, "Without me ye can do nothing." Two thousand years of human experience have established beyond debate the helplessness of men without Him. We are having now such a conclusive demonstration of what comes to a world which forgets the method and Spirit of Jesus in its larger dealings, that he who runs may read. The main task of the Church to-day is to extend the regions in which the Spirit of Jesus is really operative until they include the war-swept, war-cursed field of international relationships. There is no need to say how great this task really is, or what wisdom or patience it requires, or what re-inforcements we shall need before the task is ended, or how impossible it is without the full co-operation of statesmen, publicists, kings, cabinets, presidents and all the great instrumentalities through which public opinion is formed and codified, and by which the world is ruled. We are as yet only at the beginning of this long and difficult road, but there are some things which we already know and which need to be dwelt upon as we start out upon our journey.

To begin with, a transforming confidence in the power and validity of the Spirit of Jesus must somehow be secured. We have hitherto failed because our faith in the practical worth of His ideals has been altogether too lightly held. It is true that we believe in them for the in-

¹ An address delivered at the first National Conference of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, held at Garden City, N. Y., April 25—27.

dividual. The world is full of people who would be willing, upon occasion to bear even the supreme testimony to their confidence in His Spirit as the sole secret of individual peace and strength. We believe in them for the home. The Christian home is a solid and blessed fact in Christendom, and the peace and brotherhood of it are nothing other than the Spirit of Jesus made real in domestic relations and actually lived out day by day and generation after generation by those who think of fatherhood and motherhood, and sonship and daughterhood in terms of the Spirit of Jesus, and who lovingly, patiently, and constantly make His Spirit real within the shelter of the home. We believe in the Spirit of Jesus in social and industrial relationships—although here as yet there are large regions which have not been made subject to His ideals—and what real industrial peace and well being we possess is the expression of the Spirit of Jesus in the fellowship of toil. But we have hardly yet begun to give the Spirit of Jesus the right of way in our larger world dealings. Our diplomacy is too largely Pagan, our conceptions of national honor are semi-Pagan, our massed armaments are wholly Pagan. The great laws of brotherhood and unselfishness are not yet international laws. We have not even begun to dare to trust wholly in justice and fair dealing as the only solvents of strained relationships, the only vehicles of better understandings. The militarist philosophy to which all of Christendom is, in varying measure in bondage, is the negation of the Spirit of Jesus, and for the most part those who affirm that the law of Friendship can be made enduringly operative between nations are looked upon as hopeless dreamers. It is here, first of all, that a great burden rests upon the Christian Church. Her supreme and continuing task is to exalt and affirm and then re-exalt and re-affirm the regnancy of the Spirit of Jesus Christ and its imperial destiny. Opposing conceptions and lower ideals can find voices enough, the Church would be failing in her moment of supreme opportunity if she did not in season and out of season declare to all who fear and doubt that Jesus was no idle dreamer, but the wisest

of statesmen, that His Spirit is not an empty sentiment but a mighty and subduing force, that His methods can re-make society for its own good, that His laws are the deep unshaken laws of all human contact. The greatest danger of the controversy which is being carried on in America to-day is not that we should be over armed, but that we should lose our faith in the possibility of peace and the power of brotherhood and that the ideals of Jesus should be so darkened and misinterpreted as for the present to fail from among us, and leave the long and difficult process of ethical education to be done all over again. The power and Spirit of Jesus are the only forces which can save the world, and if the outcome of the present war and its controversies is to leave them doubted and impaired, the loss will be incalculable.

The second task of the Church is to define and illustrate the Spirit of Jesus. His ideals do not commend themselves to the world as they ought because the world does not understand their full meaning, and their far reaching implications. The Spirit of Jesus is too largely identified with a kind of spineless gentleness and placid comfort. It is the fault of the interpreters of Christianity probably that its dominant virtues, gentleness, love, goodwill, and the like have been made so invertebrate. They are not invertebrate at all; they represent in their nobler manifestations the utmost of which humanity is capable and are the very tempered steel of the soul, but we have taken the iron out of them and have so presented them that they have appeal only to the less virile element in society. We have had an uneasy feeling for a good while that our Church life on the whole represented the less positive and forceful aspects of our modern life. There has been an unhappy polarization which has ranged the gentler and more emotional temperaments alongside the apologists for things as they are under the conventional banners of the Cross. This has handicapped us sadly in our contentions for peace, and has misled both our friends and our foes; our friends because neither we nor they have clearly estimated the cost of peace or the virile splendor of the cause to which we are committed; our

foes, because it has seemed to them that what we are really afraid of is pain, sacrifice and struggle. But the Spirit of Jesus is none of these things, it is justice asking for such expression as justice has heretofore never had; it is righteousness searching out the very roots of evil in the soul; it is brotherhood demanding of all men such a consideration of the needs and possibilities of other men that each one of us is under bonds to make what we dream of as best and most desirable for ourselves the standard by which we are to measure what we seek for and accord to our fellowmen. The Spirit of Jesus is love made militant, unwearied in patience, endless in resource and rich in ethical qualities. The Spirit of Jesus is co-operation instead of competition and stewardship instead of selfishness. The Spirit of Jesus is courage incarnate. The solution of any question in that Spirit is an immensely more difficult and heroic thing than its solution on lower levels. The greater heroisms are not resident in the regions where we have always sought them; they lie rather in tempers and attitudes to which we have refused to give place because they demand of us more than we are willing to give. As long as life is what it is, and the world is what it is, there is no danger that we shall want occasions for the exercise of the highest courage; but the highest courage will be shown in sacrifice, restraint, humility, gentleness and good-will and in the resolution of difficult situations on the high levels to which these qualities are native. And all this is of the very essence of the Spirit of Jesus. The peace which the Spirit of Jesus enjoins is not the cowardly or complacent acceptance of things as they are, but the resolute endeavor to make things as they ought to be. If only the Church can somehow thus represent Christianity and back it up by a holy and unfailing consistency we shall secure a new respect for our fight for peace and bring to the standards of the Cross those who have heretofore hesitated to so enroll themselves for fear that they might be called upon to surrender the strength and devotion which alone make life splendidly worth living.

The third thing which we have to do is to arm the

Spirit of Jesus with its own proper weapons. His ideals are the most militant forces beneath the stars. He was always a soldier and those who truly follow Him are to share in all the hardships of the moral endeavor as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. He did say that He came not to bring peace but a sword, but His sword is a militant idealism acting in moral regions, and depending for its only true triumph upon moral forces. No great ideal has ever made its way in the world except at great costs and a well nigh endless strife. It has to battle against age-old conservatism, inertia and fear, prejudice and vested interests, and all the massed forces of things as they are. But on the other hand, when any great ideal has really triumphed and the smoke has cleared away and we have come to see the battle for what it really was, we see that its true weapons have always been its own inherent rightfulness, its profound unity with all the laws of right thinking and right living, and its great power to vindicate itself by the very quality of its triumphs. No man would dare to stand in this or any other presence and say that force mobilized in armies and going abroad in fleets has not been one aspect of the battle of moral idealism. There have been times when those who served a great cause, acting in what light they had, could see no other alternative than the sword itself. They unsheathed it with conviction, they fought as Christians, they died for causes vaster than themselves, and their death was never in vain. Nor would anyone dare to prophesy that the occasion for such wars has finally passed. But on the other hand, there was always, even in those wars which at the judgment bar of history may be counted as most nearly holy, a better way. The wars which have been professedly fought for ideals have too often impeded the very ideals by which they justified themselves, and left the work to be done all over again by its true methods, and that at greater costs than as if those true methods had been sought to begin with; and generally war has so overlain and concealed the true operation of the really saving forces as greatly to mislead us.

There is only one final way to overcome evil and that is

by good. Christianity is not and never has been non-resistant. It is the higher resistance incarnate, but its true weapons are justice, fair dealing and patience in the face of provocation, the brave and even sacrificial appeal to the humanity of humanity, and an unfailing confidence that these and these alone are the only forces which can finally have their way with the world. It is idle to try and fight the devil with his own weapons. He is a past master in their use. Fighting fire with fire is a desperate expedient; fire is best fought by fire-proof construction, and by precautions which see to it that not even a spark falls where it ought not to fall. Militarism cannot be conquered by militarism, nor can the martial spirit of the people be subdued by force. If history teaches anything, it teaches that the attempt to crush the martial spirit of a people by conquest and harsh arbitrary terms has but intensified that spirit, and pacifist as I am, I glory in that. Again and again in the last three centuries one or the other of the nations or groups of nations has had its way utterly with its neighbors. Arrogant victors have imposed crushing terms of peace and sought to bleed the conquered white, burdened them with crushing debts and even dictated disarmament and the only result in every instance has been to rebaptize the nations so treated in a more tempered determination, a more fire-like hatred of the force which so dealt with them, and to sow the field so ploughed with the seeds of further strife. On the other hand, where justice, magnanimity and brotherhood have found any expression at all in national dealings they have healed old wounds, created new friendships, made possible positive advances in brotherhood. How long will it take us to really learn all this?

If the present war is teaching us anything, it is teaching us that it is always possible to organize Europe or if need be the world, in such nearly balanced groups that the conflict between them becomes simply a war of endurance, in which all are exhausted and in which the trenches which hide opposing lines establish limits which cannot really be over-passed. The dream of either one of the belligerent groups to dictate terms of peace in con-

quered capitols is a dream which they all alike have surrendered. Friendship is the only force which can ever come into the capitol of a neighboring nation and abide there. Justice and justice alone can pass defended frontiers. Brotherhood, not as a sentiment, but as a diplomatic procedure and incarnate in manifold forms of human intercourse, is the only force which can ever make itself free of alien lands. No barriers have ever been established which friendship and justice have not in the end been able to cross. These are the weapons of the Spirit of Jesus, with these that Spirit must be armed.

Beyond all that, the mightiest weapon of the Spirit of Jesus is the Cross itself, the appeal that is of sacrificial love. Suffering bravely borne is the last great appeal, the ultimate force. This is not sentiment, this is fact. It conquers when everything else is defeated, it melts the most stubborn disposition, it wins the hardest heart. With the Cross, Jesus armed Himself, in that sign His disciples have conquered, nor has the occasion for its employment passed. But its operation must not be limited if it is to do its mighty work; even in the individual it must possess the whole of life. We shall be misunderstood and rightly scorned if we profess sacrificial unselfishness in one thing while we are selfish and greedy in something else. I doubt if a nation will get much credit for patience and forbearance in dealing with those who challenge and irritate it, if it is at the same time growing rich by the sale of munitions of war. If it is wanting in moral passion enough to make the first great sacrifice, it will very likely be thought cowardly and ease-loving when it tries to make the second. It is hard to see how we could have avoided the situation in which we find ourselves as far as the manufacture and sale of munitions is concerned, and yet it is just this which has taken the heart out of our pacifist policy. I do not wonder that those of the belligerents who profit by us think unkindly of us, or that those who are hurt by us are bitter indeed. If our hands were clean we might well offer our dead as a sacrifice to the world's brotherhood in the hope that when bitterness and passion had been quieted they would

make a mightier appeal to the nations for the freedom of the seas hereafter than all the passing of notes or the issuing of ultimatums. But however that may be, the ideals of Jesus will not be supremely triumphant until we have made the Cross their method and have shared the pain of it.

There is much to be said here for which there is no room. The ideals of Jesus thus armed are not only militant, they are comprehensive and tolerant. They allow place for the instincts and just demands of all national life, they do not seek uniformity, they seek a rich variety; they do not ask any nation to cease to be, but only to come into a richer life by accepting the supremacy of great methods and conceptions which are larger than anyone of us, and in the full operation of which we shall all find our peace.

If the Spirit of Jesus is to be supreme in the world we must seek in season and out of season for social, industrial, political, diplomatic and even governmental forms in which the Spirit of Jesus will function naturally, express itself freely, gladly and without friction. For my part, I believe this is supremely essential and immensely difficult. There is an end to what the most consecrated and best intentioned individual can do if he is to live and work in an environment whose more massive manifestations are constantly thwarting and defeating him. We all know that when we go about so far in the conduct of our individual lives in the most sincere endeavor to be true to the Spirit of Christ, we meet with conditions which defeat and undo us. The very necessities of modern business life again and again compel the most sincerely Christian business man to accept un-Christian conditions and even to employ un-Christian methods. This is true of politics, it is certainly true of diplomacy and statecraft. Every one of the belligerent nations is protesting that it did not seek this war. We may allow for all their special pleading and yet still be compelled to believe them. I don't see how anyone can examine carefully and impartially the deeply rooted and complex conditions which led up to the present world fighting without seeing that the

world is in the grasp of forces which automatically produce tension, which tend constantly to express themselves in war.

Here is the paradox of Twentieth Century civilization. We are sincerely desirous, multitudes of us, in every land and under every flag of making the Spirit of Jesus supreme and yet we are again and again defeated, flung back from our goals in despair. What is the reason? It must be that we are trying to express the Spirit of Jesus through organic forms which are un-Christian and that we must seek a deeper and more radical solution of our problem. There must be ways of living together which reinforce instead of always weakening and sometimes defeating the Spirit of Jesus. We are under bonds to find them out, and to release them. Sometimes there comes to us in our thoughtful moments the vision of a social and industrial order whose laws are so perfectly the laws of Christ and whose Spirit is so essentially the Spirit of Christ that to live in a world like that would be a joy, to serve in it a sacrament; then Monday's task would be the fulfillment of Sunday's vision, and all that Christ asks of us would be the free expression of our every energy. And then the vision darkens and we see how much there is in life to-day which is fundamentally at variance with such an expectation. War is just the final expression of the implicit hostilities of our social and industrial order. It is deeply rooted in economic causes. Publicists of the future will trace for us the beginnings of our fighting in industrial competition, in the operations of capitalism, in the fight for markets, in the operations of the trader, in the attempt to monopolize trade routes and gain concession in the unexploited parts of the world.

I do not believe that we shall ever have peace as long as industry is organized on a competitive instead of a co-operative basis. Quite the most searching words which have been said in this conference have had to do with just that. No one of us understands clearly how this reorganization of industry is to be secured, but we may at least clear about us little spaces in which co-operation

and brotherhood are law and method, and we must extend them just as rapidly as we have wisdom and power. We of the Church may begin with what is nearest to our hand, the Church itself and the fellowship of the Church. If nothing more comes out of such meetings as these than a new sense of brotherhood and a free and deepening Christian union, we shall have gained immensely. The Church will not be in a position to preach brotherhood to the world until it makes brotherhood a bit more real in its own life. A divided Church will not greatly impress a divided world. Warring creeds and denominations preaching peace will not carry far. It seems to me that the whole triumph of the Spirit of Jesus is involved in such considerations as these. The quest for peace is as a seamless robe. We cannot make the Spirit of Jesus supreme in the lesser things until we have made it supreme in the greatest; nor ask people to believe in Christian idealism or to try to live it out when it is slowly broken down before our eyes and the skies are all aflame with forces which mock and deny it. On the other hand we shall never see the triumph of Jesus in the things most remote until we have made it real and compelling in what is nearest to us. The Spirit of Jesus is not a "one-track" Spirit, it is as Catholic as humanity, it needs for its use all the roads which men travel. It will not have triumphed until it has been made incarnate in institutions which are so essentially Christian that the very operation of them makes for justice and brotherhood.

Very likely this is in the direction of socialism; very well, let it be so. Socialism is a big word and has many meanings, but its simplest and most accessible meaning is co-operation in the whole business of life. Wherever we make co-operation supreme we cut at least one ramification of the almost infinitely complex rootings of war in society. If we cut roots enough some day the tree will die. It is the continuing task of the Church to dig out and destroy the roots of war.

Finally, we are to trust ourselves to the Spirit of Jesus without reservation in the saving confidence that we are trusting ourselves to the only true methods of life. We

need not be afraid; we have the big and final things on our side. Bismark once said that even in making war the nation should take account of the imponderables, they are the only things which count whether in war or peace. The representatives of the belligerents will presently gather together to settle about a council table what they might have settled about a council table to begin with if they had been so minded; then they will have to take account of the imponderables. Justice will be there and brotherhood, and the causes of humanity and the spirit of outraged nationality—they will all be there, and they will be there in the person of Jesus Christ. This is not mysticism; this is simply saying that the ideals by which Christian nations must be governed in making peace are ultimately the Christian ideals, and they cannot be escaped. There is indeed the struggle for the life of others. It blooms in the flowers, it sways in the grasses, it mitigates the ferocities of the jungle, it transforms the instincts of the brute, it grows beautiful in motherhood, gracious in fatherhood, tender in all concern for the weak and dependent and the suffering. It has again and again been made nobly regnant in massive human attitudes, it will conquer the whole some day. We may trust it without fear and serve it in the only enduring joy which life may really know—it is the secret of all peace.

Providence, R. I.

ARTICLE VIII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"The Response of Jesus Christ to Modern Thought" is discussed by Dr. E. Y. Mullins of Louisville in *The Review and Expositor* (April). The young preacher must be acquainted with the so-called "modern thought." He is often puzzled by the complex problems suggested by it and by the contradictory ways in which it appears in the writings of the modern philosopher. It is reasonable to expect that in a perfect revelation provision should be made to meet all religious questions that may arise through the centuries. It is the task of the modern preacher to find out what Jesus has to say on this matter.

"The answer of Jesus to modern thought is found in what He said, in what He was, and in what He did: His gospel, His incarnation and His atoning work."

His response to modern thought, then may be gathered up in the following statements:

1. In His assertion of the autonomy and independence of religion, Jesus thereby declares the freedom and autonomy of all forms of human culture. All great values have their place. Science and philosophy have their particular realm. The former observes and classifies; the latter explains. They work on the principle of rationality. Religion works on the principle of personality. The two principles are valid and not contradictory; but the latter and larger principle cannot be explained by the former. Religion is autonomous and brings its own credentials and refuses to be explained away by any subtle process of reasoning.

2. "Again, the response of Jesus to modern thought is seen in this creation of a world of spiritual realities which meets the modern demand for reality in all spheres. The love of reality is a scientific passion. Jesus has made it religious passion." Science belittles man. Re-

ligion exalts him. Nothing that has been discovered in the universe is so wonderful as man. Jesus created the universe and set man in its context. To the Christian the spiritual universe is more real than rocks and trees, the ocean and the starry sky.

3. "The answer of Jesus to modern thought is found further in the central meaning of the spiritual world He has made real. The core of that world of reality is God, the Father. God became a historic fact in Jesus. This met the ancient and it meets the modern need. Men cannot feed on abstractions about God, as a vine cannot climb a moonbeam, as a tree cannot root itself in a fog bank. Philosophy was in unstable equilibrium. It is yet in unstable equilibrium, so that a modern pessimist has said philosophy is the search of a blind man in a dark room for a black cat which is not there. I do not agree with this. Jesus puts philosophy on the clew. We know noumenal reality through Him. The idea of a first cause leaves you cold. The idea of a first cause with a purpose interests you a little. The idea of a first cause who cares for men warms the heart." Jesus establishes not only the reality of God, but His great loving nature.

4. "The response of Jesus to modern thought is seen further in the eternal view He brings concerning God. 'No one knoweth the Son save the Father, and no one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son will-eth to reveal Him.' * * This is the ontology of the gospel. What God is in Himself we know through Jesus to this extent. Eternal love reigns in the Godhead. God is love. God might teach or enjoin love in a gospel without an incarnation. But only love incarnate could reveal that God is love."

Professor E. G. Martin of Cambridge, Mass., reports in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April) the results of a series of experiments as bearing upon "The Day of Rest in Nature and Human Nature."

There is nothing new in the results obtained by these laboratory observations, but they confirm the wisdom of the law of Sabbatic rest given in the Bible. It has long since been noted that men and animals can do more work in six days than in seven successive days.

In the experiments alluded to it was the purpose "to test the question of cumulative fatigue and recovery with reference to the nervous system." These tests were made for eight weeks with nine medical students as subjects. It was found that during six days the general trend of vitality was downward. "Whereas a single night's rest did not suffice to prevent the nervous tone from showing a decline, the longer interval of Sunday not only arrested the decline, but restored the nervous system to its normal condition."

It occurs to me that hostile criticism of a divine revelation must find in such experiments an answer to their objections, for the first people in the world could not have invented or discovered the law of Sabbath rest. It was revealed to them.

In *The Expositor* (May) is an interesting note on "The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ" written by Sir Alexander Simpson. He derives his information chiefly from the investigations of the late Principal Sir William Turner, a celebrated anatomist. An interesting incidental matter in this connection is that the great artists in depicting the Crucifixion, with the single exception of Rubens, represent the spear-thrust as aimed at some point on the right side of our Lord.

Mr. Turner says:

"St. John relates the piercing of the side with a spear, and states that this was not done until after Christ was dead, and after the soldiers had parted the raiment among themselves. The expression that from the wound 'forthwith came there out blood and water' has led to some discussion on the immediate cause of the

death of Christ. That which most commends itself is the explanation given by Dr. Stroud * * that in the agony the heart, or one of its great arteries, ruptured into the bag enveloping the heart, into which the blood escaped. I have examined several cases of rupture, both of the heart and of the great artery, in which the pericardial bag was greatly distended and the blood had separated into clot and watery serum. The statement which has been made by some writers, that this separation does not take place when the blood flows into the pericardium, is therefore incorrect; for the clot in such a case forms a cake surrounding the whole or the greater part of the heart and remains for days without undergoing decomposition. If the pericardium were to be pierced shortly after the rupture by a sharp weapon, such as a spear, both blood clot and watery serum would escape from the wound. That the blood and water at the crucifixion, as has been surmised by some, had been derived from a bleb formed on the outer surface of the body and evacuated through the puncture by the spear, and not from within the chest is a wild conjecture, altogether unsupported by evidence."

"The Present Situation in India" is discussed by Sherwood Eddy in *The International Review of Missions* (April). In contrast with China, which is seriously considering the claims of Christianity, India shows no sign of a break or movement among the high caste students or officials. There is, however, a most encouraging awakening among many of the Christian Churches, a mass movement among the lower castes and some signs of a similar movement toward Christianity among the great middle castes. In China the most important gains are in the cities; in India among the villages.

In India the ancient Syrian Churches are awakening. During Mr. Eddy's recent visit he was invited to speak to a great audience of 17,000 Syrian Christians. In conventions with these people he observed a new spirit of

unity among these several sects and found that service was the keynote of all addresses, and that a movement to evangelize the surrounding Hindus was to be undertaken.

In the South India United Church, numbering 165,000, and composed of Presbyterian, Congregational, Dutch Reformed and Scottish Churches, a week of simultaneous evangelism resulted in the conversion of thousands.

The hope in student work in India to-day lies in the Christian staff of each mission college. The attitude of non-Christian students is characterized by four things: nationalism, devotion to the old Hindu religions, and yet by evidence of the disintegration of Hinduism and lastly the unconscious appropriation of Christian truth.

The old religions of India are declining and falling as did those of pagan Rome.

In an article on "Philosophy and the Problem of Revelation" in the *Princeton Review* (April) Dr. Henry William Rankin says:

"In the volume on *Darwin and Modern Science* (1909) Bateson says that 'No one can survey the work of recent years without perceiving that evolutionary orthodoxy developed too fast, and a great deal has got to come down.' But a few years ago Darwin's creed was settled science. Where is it to-day? Ask the President of the British Association at Melbourne. In his address he says, 'We go to Darwin for his incomparable collection of facts. We would fain emulate his scholarship, his width, and his power of exposition; but to us he speaks no more with philosophical authority. We read his scheme of evolution as we would those of Lucretius, or of Lamarck, delighting in their simplicity and courage.' "

"Who that has read the annual addresses before that tribunal of science has not marked the frequent revisions and contradictions in the changing creed called knowledge as distinguished from that Christian creed which nineteen centuries have confirmed with ever increasing evidence to this day? The fundamental creeds of Chris-

tianity are supported by a consensus of testimony and a range of corroboration such as no modern science has acquired; and despite all the opposition they have suffered, largely as the result of that opposition, they are more easily and more cogently defended than ever before since they were framed. It is want of adequate attention to their evidence, and nothing else, unless the moral grounds of that neglect, that leaves them discredited by any man. Men listen to the incantation of the *Zeitgeist*, and often become deaf to anything else preposessed and obsessed with some latest novelties of thought, and refuse to explore the mountains of unrefuted evidence by which some of the oldest creeds of the Christian Church still claim the right to rule our consciences."

William N. Appel of Lancaster, writes a ringing protest against "Secularizing the Church" in the *Reformed Church Review*. He believes that the present day tendency of the churches to invade all the departments of life as an administrator and executive to be unwholesome and harmful. The catering to the spirit of amusement, to deal with all kinds of secular themes in the pulpit and to appear as prosecutors before legal tribunals are not the functions of the Church. It is sin and not crime that the Church must deal with. It is the regeneration of the individual rather than the reformation of morals that the Church must aim at. Her work is fundamental, having to do with the tree and not with the fruit.

The minister has the high and holy business of preaching the gospel, but "upon a revelation of the modern Church and its work, it appears as if the layman had captured the ministry and harnessed it to all so-called human and worldly movements, and somehow the Church has failed to infuse and dominate the social order with its divinely given life and spirit."

As a layman, Mr. Appel, protests against the secularizing of the Church. "Alas," says he, "that this cry of warning should come from a layman! At the time of the

world's greatest need for spiritual and religious regeneration the Church seems weakest and least able to furnish the supply of food.

The Lutheran of June 15 contains a rejoinder to the above article from the pen of another prominent layman of the city of Lancaster, Mr. Wm. H. Hager. He holds that the Church must do more than "co-operate with the citizen and the State." It must assume the leadership in reform movements for the purification of the community and to do this effectively it must be willing to submit to things that are unpleasant. He claims that the campaign against vice in Lancaster has been justified by intolerable conditions and gratifying results. He specifies the suppression of fifty bawdy houses, the destruction of commercialized vice, the closing of five hotels and of twenty-five side-rooms of saloons frequented by men and women; the stopping of indecent burlesque shows and similar shows at fairs and circuses; the suppression of baseball pools, a gambling institution; the conviction of five Sunday beer clubs, one having four hundred and fifty members, the worst center of prostitution, unmolested for twenty-three years, and so forth.

Surely Mr. Hager has made out a strong case for the Law and Order Society and similar associations. Personally I have been forced by circumstances to do similar work with marked improvement to the community.

The principle advocated by Mr. Appel is undoubtedly normal and correct. The practice defended by Mr. Hager is likewise justifiable under certain circumstances. When party politics becomes the ally of vice almost anything may be done to bring a community to its senses. "Have ye not read what David did, when he was hungry, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and ate the showbread, which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests?"

Gettysburg, Pa.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

A book that in a few months sells more than two million copies is certainly worthy of special mention. Such has been the case with Doctor Paul Conrad's little book entitled "*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott.*" It is a small book and covers only 32 pages. But it was written as a practical book of devotion for the soldiers in the embattled armies of Germany, and it has accomplished its purpose admirably. That accounts for its wide sale.

The devotional literature that has been issued for the purpose of ministering to the spiritual needs of the German soldiers bulks to tremendous proportions, but Conrad's little work seems to go more directly to the point than any of the others and so it has far surpassed all the others in its sale and distribution. It is the one book that the German soldier reads more than any other except the Bible. And Doctor Conrad, who is a pastor in Berlin, has been styled the spiritual guide of the German people in war times.

The little book that bears the superscription of Luther's battle-hymn is found in the hands of soldiers of the most divergent religious faith. It contains twenty short, spicy passages of devotional material. It opens with some incisive words from Bismarck and with Luther's prayer before battle. It closes with several strong verses of prayer. Some of the other passages are entitled: Helmet off for Prayer, Old Times, Be Still before God, The Cross, Comradeship, Entrusted to God's Care, Manly and Humanly, Obedience, Self-Control, Sacred Memories, Unity, Patience, Hail to the Kaiser, The Last Call. These are subjects that soon catch the interest of the soldier and reach his heart. And they are presented in a most effective way. So that the booklet has proved to be the most popular of all the large number of devotional guides that are being offered to the German soldier. It is carried along on the march; it occupies many a moment in the trenches that would otherwise be spent in

weary idleness; and it is the wounded soldier's special companion on his bed in the hospital.

But the soldier at the front is not the only one who needs special spiritual ministration in these stressful times. Those who remain at home have equally heavy burdens to bear and in very many cases their souls are tried even more severely than those of the soldiers in the battle-lines. And so a voluminous devotional literature has been created to meet the spiritual needs of those who have remained behind while their friends and kin are under fire risking their lives to save the Fatherland, of those who have felt in their souls the thrill of these stirring times.

Here again Conrad has been among the most meritorious. Better than anyone else he has been able to say the proper words to reach the inmost heart of those hundreds of thousands whom the rush of recent events has made accessible to religious ideas. Three booklets that have issued from his pen since the war began have met with extraordinary success. They bear the titles: *Be Still before God*, *Be Strong in the Lord*, and *The Cup of Salvation*. Deeply devotional, carrying a strong appeal to the intellect and a sharp stimulus for the will, they cannot fail to inspire courage in the despairing heart. A happy note of optimism rings out everywhere. "If God is for us, who can be against us?" These tones strike a responsive chord in the German heart and furnish nourishing food for the soul. In all the great mass of religious literature that is being issued with a special view to the needs of the times, nothing has surpassed in excellence and in popularity the little books of Pastor Conrad. They are written in a way and with a content that appeals to all classes, and their author well deserves to be called the soul physician of the German people both at home and at the front.

Another work of note along this same line, but appealing more particularly to the intellectual classes, has just appeared from the pen of the eminent churchman and theologian, Professor Reinhold Seeberg. This book is entitled "*Eternal Life*" and is intended to be a book of

comfort for educated people in their hours of anxiety and trial and especially in their seasons of pain and grief.

Professor Seeberg's book grew out of a public lecture that he delivered on Memorial Sunday. The effect of the lecture was to raise in the inquiring minds of thinking people a whole host of concrete questions concerning the "life after death." It is a fact, whether we like it or not, that there are many people who refuse to be satisfied in their reasons or comforted in their hearts by the mere quoting of a few passages of Scripture. So Doctor Seeberg, discerning a real need, undertook to answer in a systematic way the various problems concerning the future life and to base his answers not merely upon a rehearsal of the Biblical doctrines but upon the broader basis of a general Christian philosophy. He addresses himself to the grief-stricken among the intellectual classes of Germany. His purpose is to satisfy the searchings and the questionings, to minister to the longings and the musings, of the educated Christians in these soul-racking days. From the cordial reception which the book has already had we may conclude that the author has succeeded in his purpose and that his pages reflect the thoughts that are now feeding the minds of a large class of Germans on the subject of the future existence. For that reason we reproduce here some of his leading ideas.

There is reason to believe, says Seeberg, that those who have had genuine personal relationships with one another here on earth will continue to have such relationships in the future life. With equal reason we may expect that the many spiritual relationships that are possible on earth but are prevented from being realized because of unfavorable circumstances will be realized in the hereafter to the common advantage of all parties. It is the primitive Will or God from whom emanates the whole stream of spiritual development. He causes that stream to flow and He directs it in its course. Now the more a life is saturated with the power of that spiritual stream, the closer and livelier is its approach to the very fountain of spirit, and the more intimately does that person feel himself embraced in the fold of the divine Spirit. The

life of the spirit, into which the life of the individual is resolved, is at the same time a life of fellowship with God. That fellowship the human soul experiences already here below when it feels the realities of the spiritual life. And this experience of divine fellowship continues in increasing degree as the soul progresses in its spiritual life. We easily understand, therefore, that this life of fellowship with God is eternal life. It is a personal relationship begun here under limitations and continued hereafter free from limitations.

But this spiritual life which has its origin in God is necessarily also a moral and a holy life. That is to say, if a man loses his morality and his holiness he thereby loses also eternal life and salvation. This is a necessary consequence. There is nothing arbitrary about it. It is not as if this loss, this forfeiture of eternal life, would take place in the distant future as the arbitrary punishment for deeds which the individual has committed here on earth. Rather must it be understood that a man, when he becomes wicked, by that very circumstance breaks the inner continuity of his spiritual life and thus of his own accord removes himself from the state that constitutes eternal life and salvation.

When a person has thus torn himself loose from his spiritual relationship it requires a special experience to replace him again. When evil has blotted out within us the blissful consciousness which assures that we are saved and safe, how is that consciousness to be restored and how is eternal life to be renewed for us? That can be done only through Jesus Christ. The imperial power of the divine Spirit in Christ conquers the heart by filling it with the Spirit who is Life. From the person of Jesus comes the irresistible spiritual power of the primitive Will (i. e. God) which enters into the will of man and sweeps him into a stream of holy spiritual life. As the head acts on the body so Christ acts on the spiritual community which originates with Him. He guides and directs its life. The divine Life, which coursed uniformly in the person of Jesus, is divided among His followers into many little streams and rivulets. But its waters are

always the same and they make up a continuous stream of life whose essence is only comprehended by the submissive will. This stream of spiritual life is not destroyed nor even bent out of its course by the transformation which we call death.

Whoever through wickedness sinks to a lower plane of life and refuses to be swept back to the higher plane of spiritual fellowship remains forever on that low level. The only bonds that bind such a wicked man to other men are the bonds of sense. Then when death severs the bonds of sensual fellowship and physical existence, that man falls into a state of absolute personal isolation. This is what we may call the judgment or condemnation. To be utterly alone and without the senses, but filled with the memories of the life of sense and filled with supremely selfish longing after that life: that is eternal torment. To be living the spiritual life and in fellowship with the spiritual world, occupied with the service of the good and filled with unselfish efforts to realize the good: that is eternal bliss.

Those who do not succeed in attaining to eternal life remain forever in the condition in which they are placed by death. They are absolutely alone and do not come into contact with other persons. They carry within themselves pictures of the wicked and the sensual, and they have an eager longing to experience what those pictures represent. But that longing can never be gratified. Moreover, the wicked in the future life never lose their capacity for eternal life or their sense of need for it. A will which constantly stretches and strains in eager desire and earnest longing but never reaches anything or anybody and therefore is eternally bound in the misery of unquenchable thirst,—that is about the condition which we are accustomed to call hell. As a matter of fact it is a general characteristic of all divine punishments that the man who rebels against the divine order in the pursuit of his own satisfaction and pleasure, through this very course ultimately brings himself into a state which he finds to be both unsatisfying and miserable.

We may expect to recognize one another in the future

life. But of course this expression must be used with care. Our imagination does not enable us to think of any other scenes of recognition than those which we experience here on earth, where people come into physical contact with one another through the senses. The kind of recognition that will be ours in the future life is hidden from us, because from the very nature of the case we cannot in any way experience it here. For in our future state of existence we shall know one another only in our spiritual individualities and only through our interaction among one another as spiritual beings. But it must not be thought that we shall for that reason have less of our friends than when they stood before us in body and extended us their hands. We shall not have less but more. For there we shall have them in the very essence of their being, which essence often escapes us here because of the limitations placed upon our vision by sin. If we think of ourselves as having sloughed immortality, having cast off the merely physical and having burst through the limitations of sense, we realize that all the pictures of our imagination, painted as they are in the colors of our present form of existence, are utterly inadequate to express the glory that will be ours. If we could think of ourselves as separated from everything now in us that has not come from the Spirit of Christ, if we could imagine ourselves as pure members of the body of Christ so that the sum total of all our lives would in reality be the body of Christ,—then we should have a true picture of eternal bliss.

Eternal life begins here in time. It simply means that we have established a relationship with the world of spirit and that thereby we are raised above the mere life of sense with the bonds and the isolation which it imposes on our spiritual personality. Thus it is possible for us to make ourselves personally and spiritually independent of the world of sense. Then when death takes place and the threads binding us to the world of sense are severed and that world is lost to us forever, it is possible for us to maintain our contact and our relationship with the world

of spirit and thus avoid falling into that terrible isolation to which death would otherwise lead. To that relationship with the world of spirit which we thus call eternal life we are led only by Jesus Christ our Lord.

These are some of the leading thoughts that Seeberg presents in his book. For clearness and concreteness of idea on an obscure subject, for beauty and force of expression, they are scarcely excelled and they have made a deep impression among those for whom they were intended.

Many of the prominent preachers of Germany such as Ihmels of Leipzig, Hunzinger of Hamburg, and Lahusen and Dryander of Berlin, are regularly permitting their sermons to be printed. Thus they reach a much wider public than could be reached through the pulpit alone, and moreover they are made available for distribution among the soldiers in the trenches and the hospitals and even among the German soldiers in captivity in other countries.

A group of university professors, chiefly of Berlin University, among them Seeberg, Harnack, and Deissmann, have been issuing a series of thoughtful and stimulating addresses dealing in an expert way with various religious and theological problems suggested by the war. The series is known as "German Addresses in Trying Times."

Special liturgies have been prepared for the services among the soldiers at the front and for the various kinds of special church services required to meet the war needs of those at home. Special collections of sacred hymns have been published. Special collections of prayers, special collections of Scripture passages, leaflets, postcards, pamphlets, booklets, and books, all of them seeking to minister to the special religious needs of a great people at war,—these constitute the practical devotional literature of the day. It is probably very safe to assume that the devotional literature that is now issuing from the German press far exceeds in quantity any other kind of literature.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and John C. Lambert, D.D. Two volumes. Volume 1, Aaron—Systra. Cloth. Size 7 x 11. Pp. xiv 729. Price \$6.00. Sold by subscription only.

Dr. Hastings has the genius of making great encyclopaedias. He knows what is needed and whom to select to furnish it. He marshals knowledge and scholarship with consummate skill. The five large volumes of the *Dictionary of the Bible* were scarcely finished before they were followed by the two volumes of the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, which in no sense duplicate previous matter. The present series of two volumes, a *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, supplements the previous volumes, making a combination of great scope and richness. The latter two series form a complete Dictionary of the New Testament.

The Lucan authorship of the Acts is maintained in a learned article by Prof. Lake. The authorship of Hebrews can not be determined from any known facts. "All attempts to discover the author's name are reduced to mere conjecture."

Baptism is ably discussed by Dr. A. J. Maclean who holds that while immersion was at first probably the typical mode, "it is also probable that total immersion could not always be practiced, as in the case of the Philippian jailer; and that when this was the case the candidate stood in the water, which was then poured over him." He also maintains against Robinson that the R. V. has properly rendered *eis* as *into*—"into the name." Infant baptism is defended on the usual grounds with this significant conclusion in reply to the objection that infants cannot have faith: "But this is not a true objection. If an adult coming to baptism has not faith, he puts the barrier of non-faith between God and himself; he cannot be in a neutral condition, but if he does not believe in God, must disbelieve in Him. With an infant it is not so. In the age of innocence he cannot put a barrier between God

and himself, and therefore the fact that he has not yet learned to have an active faith does not preclude the working of the grace of God within him."

In discussing the Atonement Prof. Platt of the Wesleyan College in Birmingham, expresses his belief that the teachings of the Apostolic Age include both objective and subjective features. The objective atonement "is represented as accomplished once for all in the sacrificial obedience of Christ even unto death," and is realized subjectively in the self-surrender of man under the constraint of the love of God in Christ. "God declares Himself reconciled by something He had done whilst men were yet sinners." A merely mechanical satisfaction theory of the atonement cannot be found in the Apostolic teaching. "We are presented rather with an intensely ethical conception of God's requirements and with a mystical view of man's relation to Christ as the Representative of the race. Substitution is thus deepened into moral identification and solidarity." The finality of this doctrine must be maintained because it commends itself to Christian consciousness and is realized in experience.

Justification as conceived by the apostolic mind is the act of God alone. This interpretation is Luther's as over against Rome. Ritschl is declared to be "out of true lineal descent of Reformed theology when he argues that the individual believer attains certainty of salvation only as in the exercise of his religious experience he reaches dominion over the world; he is back on the old plane of 'ordinances' and 'works' which incited Luther's polemic."

The article on God contains the affirmation of the "subordination" of the Son and of the Spirit. While there is in a sense in which this is true in the work of redeeming mankind and in the official relations of the persons of the Trinity, it is not true concerning the essence of the Triune God. Since the word "subordination" was applied to the false conceptions of Arius and the imperfect views of Tertullian and Origen, it is unfortunate that it should be used in setting forth the truly Christian view of the Trinity. Dr. William Adams Brown in his *Christian Theology in Outline*, p. 145, holds that subordination is the teaching of Greek theology and that it disappeared in the West under Augustine's influence. At all events subordination is a word that ought not to be applied to persons of the Godhead. It awakens doubt as to the deity of our Lord, who is "God blessed forever."

Taking it all in all we are most favorably impressed with the present volume for its learning as well as for its conservative attitude.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLICATION HOUSE.

The Difference. A Popular Guide to Denominational History and Doctrine by I. G. Monson. Pp. 74. Price 50 cents.

This is a second book of a popular type on Comparative Symbolics, that has been given to us in English. The first was a translation of the 12th ed. of Graul's work, "Distinctive Doctrines," by Dr. D. M. Marteus. This new book of Rev. I. G. Monson, who is a member of the Norwegian Lutheran Synod, has one decided advantage over the former: It is written with reference to conditions in America.

Many of our ministers and laymen have been craving for just such a help by which to become quickly informed on the leading differences between the denominations of Christendom, especially as represented in our country. The aim of the author is given in the following words: It was "to be more suggestive than exhaustive, to avoid all technicalities, and to treat the different dogmas in such a manner that the common, everyday Christian could understand them."

The special type of this little book on Symbolics is that which was first introduced by Winer. The differences are tabulated in a comparative way. Doctrine after doctrine is taken up and the different conceptions of the churches are enumerated. But the author has added the element of polemics, much in the manner of the larger German work of Prof. Guenther. First, the Bible doctrine is stated on the basis of clear passages of Scripture. Then follows a quotation from the Confessions covering that doctrine. Then the errors of the different churches are presented with refutations by Scripture passages.

A danger easily accompanying this method is to quote passages of Scripture that do not prove conclusively. There are many cases of that kind in Guenther; whether also in this book may be examined by the reader. It is well to remember that he who wants to prove too much

does not prove enough. The harmony of the Scriptures (analogy of faith) should also not be overlooked.

Following the Winer method there is no chance for weaving into the discussions the historical element which is often of greatest importance for understanding an erroneous development and for a successful refutation. But our author has very ably supplied that need with a first part which furnishes in brief indications the keys of history.

There is not enough bold type in the book. In a treatise of so many divisions and sub-divisions the names of churches and leaders and the leading thoughts in many paragraphs should stand out in heavy print, and sub-thoughts should be indicated by italics.

J. L. NEVE.

Weg des Lebens. Sermons on the Epistles of the Church Year, by Pastor C. C. Schmidt, St. Louis, Mo.

The author of these sermons is the well-known pastor of the church in St. Louis, of which the professors and students of the seminary of the Missouri Synod, the largest theological seminary in the world (with between three and four hundred students) are members. One can expect that the minister in such a church is one with special gifts in preaching and one that uses and has to use great care in the preparation of the sermons. These sermons are masterpieces as to content and form. The diction is very simple and natural. There are no involved sentences and high sounding phrases. The form is beautiful, but not because of any aiming at beauty of style, but simply because the preacher finds without any artificiality the adequate form for the divine truth which he wants to sink into the hearts of his hearers. The sermons are deeply evangelical. Everywhere the Word is rightly divided because Law and Gospel are in proper relation to each other. There is a strong educational force in this book for any one who would like to have an answer to this one question: What does it mean to preach the Gospel?

J. L. NEVE.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

The Centennial History of the American Bible Society.

By Henry Otis Dwight. 8vo. Cloth. Pp. 605. Price \$1.00. In paper binding 50 cents.

This is not a volume of dry statistics, as one might ex-

pect. Indeed, we have been distinctly disappointed to find so few statistics in it. It is a veritable "history" of a great enterprise, and few histories could be found more interesting as to content, or more fascinatingly written.

Few persons, we imagine, know that the American Congress ever took action recognizing the importance of the Bible as a national necessity, and providing a supply for distribution among the army and people of the new nation. The story is told in the following paragraph found on page 3: "With all the other upheavals which the Revolution brought to the colonies it suddenly stopped Bible sales. Connection had been severed with the London printing houses. In 1777 a famine of Bibles was one of the many ills which a distracted Congress was called upon promptly to remedy at one of the Pennsylvania towns where it was able to meet in security. Dr. Allison, one of its chaplains, petitioned Congress to order the printing of at least twenty thousand Bibles. The lack of suitable paper, and even of sufficient type, in all the thirteen States for such a work negatived the scheme; but Congress voted by seven States against six to import twenty thousand Bibles from Holland, and this plan was set in execution."

The American Bible Society was organized in the city of New York in May 1816. The organization of a national society was largely the result of the persistent efforts of Samuel J. Mills who had been acting as an itinerant missionry and Bible distributor in the West and Southwest and who was appalled at the destitution of the Holy Scriptures which he found among the scattered people in the new settlements. In one of his reports he writes, "There are districts containing from twenty to fifty thousand people entirely destitute of the Scriptures and of religious privileges. How shall they hear without a preacher? Never will the impression be erased from our hearts that has been made by beholding those scenes of wide-spread desolation. The whole country from Lake Erie to the Gulf of Mexico is as the valley of the shadow of death. Only here and there a few rays of gospel light pierced through the awful gloom. This vast expanse of our country contains more than one million inhabitants. The number of Bibles sent to them by all the societies in the United States is by no means as great as the yearly increase of the population. The original number of people still remains unsupplied."

This was in 1812-'15. It is estimated that there were

then not less than one hundred local Bible Societies in the various cities and States of the country. But there was no co-operation between them, and no concentration of effort and means. Hence the desire for a general Society which might bring these scattered forces together and work for united and consequently much greater results.

This book tells the story of how this was accomplished and of the wonderful things that have been wrought in the hundred years between May 1816 and May 1916. It is a gripping story, and heartening too. During this hundred years more than one hundred millions of volumes containing either the entire Bible, or the New Testament, or parts thereof, have been distributed in every country to which the Christian missionary has gone with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and in every language and dialect which has been reduced to written form. No wonder that some writers have called this story "The Romance of the Bible Society." It is more interesting and compelling than any romance, because it is a story of actual accomplishment, the story of what God has wrought by and through His Word.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

Psychological Studies in Lutheranism. By Paul Harold Heisey, M.A. With an Introduction by Professor Jacob A. Clutz, D.D. Pp. 143. Price 75 cents net,

The author of this volume is one of our younger General Synod pastors, who has earnestly devoted himself to study since graduating from Midland College and the Western Theological Seminary in 1910. He had special facilities for this by reason of the fact that his first charge was at North Liberty, Iowa, only a few miles from Iowa City, the seat of the State University of Iowa. He promptly took up a regular course in the university and received the Master's degree from it in 1911. He then continued as a graduate student from 1912 to 1915, his chief subjects being Philosophy and Psychology. He also gave much attention to the subject of Religious education.

It was while pursuing these studies that he became interested in the general subject of the Psychology of Religion, working under the direction of Professor E. D. Starbuck, one of the pioneers in this subject in this country. One of the chapters of the present volume was first

prepared as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master's degree. This was Chapter II, on "A Study in the Mysticism of Luther." This, and three of the other chapters, on "The Psychological Study of Religion," "A Psychological Study of Lutheranism," and "The Psychology of the Religious Revival," have been printed before, the first three in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, and the fourth in *The Lutheran Church Review*. To these has been added a fifth chapter on "The Psychology of Confirmation."

Mr. Heisey has done his work well, especially when it is remembered that he is a pioneer in this particular phase of the subject. Since the appearance of Professor Starbuck's book on "The Psychology of Religion" in 1899, there has been a flood of books on one phase and another of this general subject. But so far as the reviewer knows this little book of Mr. Heisey's is the first formal and extended attempt to apply the Psychology of Religion to the interpretation of the Christian experience and life of a particular denomination.

Of course, other writers have discussed the differences in the experience of different persons, and different classes of persons, and the causes for these found in the environment and training provided by the different denominations. Especially has this been the case with Starbuck and James and Cutten. The latter has a special chapter on "Denominationalism" in his volume on "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity" published in 1908.

The reviewer may be permitted to quote here two short paragraphs from his introduction to Mr. Heisey's book.

"Mr. Heisey is simply following this lead, (of Starbuck, James and Cutten, referred to above), when he now undertakes in this volume to present a study, from the standpoint of Psychology, of some of the peculiarities of the great Lutheran Church to which he belongs, and of Martin Luther the great Reformer to whom under God the Lutheran Church owes its origin and its name, as well as many of its characteristics in doctrine and life. The work may be somewhat fragmentary and incomplete, as all such pioneer work is apt to be of necessity. But it is a very interesting and promising beginning. I have no doubt that it will be followed in due time by more elaborate studies of the same character, either by the same author or by others, very likely by both.

"Not only so, but it will in all probability suggest similar studies of the other great denominations, and eventu-

ally comparative studies of the different denominations. And who knows but that such studies may prove by and by to be an important step towards a better understanding between the several denominations of Christians and a more fraternal relation and co-operation."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America. By Dr. J. L. Neve, Professor of Symbolics and History of Doctrine in Wittenberg Seminary, Springfield, Ohio. Second Revised and Enlarged Edition. Cloth, 464 pages. Price \$1.75.

Dr. Neve has performed a very real and most important service to the Church by writing this history in the first place, and now again by rewriting and extending it in this second edition. That this service has been appreciated is shown by the fact that when the first edition appeared, in 1903, it was very soon adopted as a textbook in most of the Lutheran theological seminaries in this country. In this way it has already done much to give to our younger men in the ministry, in all parts of the Church, a clearer understanding and a better appreciation of the many difficulties and discouragements under which the founders of the Lutheran Church in America labored. They are thus much better prepared to meet the problems of the Church for to-day, and to plan and work for the greater and better things of the future.

In this second edition the book has been largely rewritten, and made much fuller in parts, so that it now has about twice as many pages as in the first edition. The statistics, and other historical matter, have been brought up to date, in a number of cases facts and figures being given that belong to the present year, 1916. All this will add very much to the value of the history, and will no doubt add to its popularity and increase its circulation. Not only every Lutheran minister, but all our intelligent laymen also, should read and study this volume. It will give them a new insight into the many perplexing problems of the Church and will prepare them to work much more intelligently and sympathetically for their solution.

The method of treatment followed in this volume is practically the same as in the first edition. This can, perhaps, be best stated by the author himself. In his brief introductory remarks, he says: "Reviewing the 250 years of Lutheran history in America, the historian faces the question: How is the material to be treated? Shall he simply enumerate the leading events, and by co-ordinating them sacrifice the real historical character of the work? This was too much the case in the first attempt that was made in our country, in Dr. E. J. Wolf's "Lutherans in America." Or shall we (like Jacobs and Fritschel) trace the development chiefly from the viewpoint of confessional progress? This plan would certainly be interesting; but it is easily confusing for the beginner, and this book is to be a hand-book of the history of the Lutheran Church in America for students who first want to find their bearings before they investigate more extensively. So we purpose to present the history here simply from the viewpoint of organization and growth."

In working out this plan, Dr. Neve divides his history into three periods. The first period deals with the "Origin of Individual Congregations," and covers about one hundred years, from about 1640 to the arrival of Muhlenberg in 1742. It is divided into three sections: 1. The Dutch Lutherans, chiefly in and about New York. 2. The Swedish Lutherans, chiefly in and about Philadelphia and Wilmington. 3. The German Lutherans, chiefly in eastern Pennsylvania, with some scattered settlements in the states of New York and Georgia. The second period deals with the organization of congregations into synods. This period covers about three-quarters of a century, from the coming of Muhlenberg in 1742 to the early part of the nineteenth century when the first steps were taken which culminated in the organization of the General Synod in 1820. It saw the origin of at least six district synods, the Old Pennsylvania Synod or Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the North Carolina Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, and the Tennessee Synod. This was a great step in advance which was largely the result of the wisdom and patience and devotion of the Patriarch Muhlenberg. The discussion of these two periods occupies less than 100 pages. The third period treats of the organization of the district synods into larger general bodies, the General Synod, the General Council, the United Synod in the South, the Synodi-

cal Conference, etc. This period occupies the remainder of the book, and includes an account of the several Lutheran Synods which still remain independent, never having joined any of the general bodies, or having joined one or another of them and then again withdrawn.

In presenting the history of the different synods and general bodies the author claims to have "sincerely aimed at impartiality." He says, "He has not intentionally magnified the work of one synod or minimized the merits of another. In presenting the history of his own synod, he has not tried to cover up the shortcomings of the past." Having read the volume through with some care we can testify to the truthfulness of this claim, though it would be strange if no fault should be found by any. Indeed, we are disposed to think that Dr. Neve has been unnecessarily frank in uncovering the weaknesses and past shortcomings of "his own synod," the General Synod. We would not say that he has in any case over magnified these, but he might, in extenuation of them, have more fully emphasized the fact that the General Synod was standing for a very positive type of Lutheranism when some of the bodies which now want to pose as the only simon-pure Lutherans were much less pronounced in their allegiance to the true confessional faith of the Church than the General Synod has ever been. But doubtless it was better to err on the side of charity.

The story which Dr. Neve had to tell is a most interesting one, and he has told it in a most interesting way. It is often a pathetic story, and sometimes even tragic. As one rises from the reading of the story, he cannot help feeling that many of the fathers of the Church, and even some of the present day leaders, have been over zealous about the tithing of the mint, anise and cummin of the most minute points of doctrine, and have often forgotten or neglected the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy and love. If they had been just a little broader and more charitable in regard to minute differences, without sacrificing any of the essentials of either faith or practice, how different the history of our great Church might have been in this country. Instead of presenting to other denominations and to the world the pitiable spectacle of a Church divided and subdivided within itself almost to the *n*th degree, and often spending its strength in contentions within that tend to weakness and self-destruction, we might have presented a united front which would have made us tenfold the power we have been in defense of the integrity of the Scriptures, purity of doc-

trine and holiness of life. Certainly, we cannot much blame those who, looking on from without, conclude that there are many different kinds of Lutherans.

No doubt Dr. Neve is correct when he says in his final "Review of the Extension of the Lutheran Church in America," "The history of the Lutheran Church in this country has been marked by violent controversies. Looking at these from the viewpoint of Christian charity, we do not doubt that much offense has been given. Men have mistaken their personal opinions for the divine truth. Human obstinacy may have been substituted for holy zeal. But, on the whole, it must be conceded that the underlying purpose has been loyalty to the Word of God. These controversies prove that the Church has not lost its vitality, and is still able to defy the new "science with its scorn of an infallible Bible." Still, we cannot help feeling that the Church might much better have shown its vitality by unitedly contending against the enemies of the truth, instead of contending within itself about the truth of minute points of doctrine and of practice concerning which there never has been, and never will be, entire agreement among Lutherans.

The usefulness and consequent value of Dr. Neve's history is greatly increased by the arrangement of the matter. The division into chapters, and sections, and numbered paragraphs, and the use of heavy faced type to call attention to key words and phrases, together with a system of cross-references, and many foot notes, greatly facilitate the use of the book, and make it easy to follow up any particular point or subject in the different periods. Another valuable feature of the book is the rather full biographical notes at the close of each chapter or period. These include brief sketches of a number of men still living who have played an important part in the history of the several synods or general bodies, or in the founding and development of their institutions. Besides a very full table of contents, there are also two very full and carefully arranged indexes, a "Personal Index" giving the names of the men referred to in the history, and a "Topical Index."

The book is well printed and well bound, and has the admirable quality of lying open at any page without being weighted. We have observed a number of typographical errors and some misstatements of fact which more careful proof reading would have corrected.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY. OBERLIN, OHIO.

The Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect. A study of the Intermediate State. By John Elliott Wishart, D.D. Pp. 170. Price \$1.00.

"If a man die shall he live again?" To this ever recurring question of all the ages, the natural instinct of man has almost universally answered, Yes. There have been great differences of opinion, however, as to the many related questions connected with the belief in immortality, even among Christian believers. Will there be an immortality of the body as well as for the soul? If the body is to be raised up and reunited with the soul, when, and how, shall it be raised up? Will the resurrection body be composed of the same particles which belong to the body that dies and is laid in the grave? Or, will it be a spiritual, or spiritualized body, that will preserve its identity in some other way than by a literal identity of particles? What is the condition, and place, and experience of the disembodied spirit during the time intervening between death and the resurrection? Is it conscious or unconscious? Is it capable of intercourse with others? Is it active or inactive? If active, what is the nature of its employments? Does it know and recognize those who were its friends in life? Does it have any knowledge of what is going on in the world from which it has been removed by death? These, and a hundred other like questions, are constantly occurring and recurring to the thoughtful mind. What answer to them is possible?

These, and such as these, are the questions discussed in this interesting little volume by Dr. Wishart. The discussions are of course brief, but they are eminently clear, and as satisfactory and conclusive as can be expected under the circumstances. The Bible, of course, and mainly the New Testament, is taken as the guide and final authority. The conclusions reached, and the positions maintained are mainly those which the various branches of the orthodox Protestant Church have long maintained and expressed in their creeds. They are summed up by the author in a single paragraph in the last of the sixteen chapters which make up the volume. He says:

"These fundamental truths may be stated in a few words: that the soul lives on in conscious, personal existence; that at death its character is fixed, and that it is dealt with on the basis of character, under grace, and is granted a reward or suffers punishment; that it will be

engaged in spiritual activities and will have capacity and opportunity, if it be on the upward course, for constant progress; and that it will have fellowship with God, with angels, and with other redeemed spirits like itself. These are essential positions for which, amid much that is doubtful, we make bold to contend."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

The Lutheran Manual. By Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D., author of "Heavenward," "The Atonement and Modern Thought," &c. Fourth and Revised Edition. Cloth. Pp. 225. Price \$1.00 net.

It is a high compliment to the author of *The Lutheran Manual* that a fourth edition has been called for. The Manual, as its name indicates, is a Hand-book—a handy book, which gives in a simple yet comprehensive manner a statement of the doctrines, worship, government and work of the Lutheran Church in America. It is adapted to the laity as well as to the clergy. To a non-Lutheran it will give in brief compass an insight into the nature and worship of a great Church.

The present edition is an improvement on those going before in accuracy of statement on doctrine and in bringing statistics to date. We notice a serious misprint on page 212, where the General Synod is credited with giving two hundred and forty million dollars to missions in a single biennium! It should be as many thousand.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

F. H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK.

The Churches of the Federal Council, Their History, Organization and Instinctive Characteristics and a Statement of the Development of the Federal Council, edited by Charles S. Macfarland, General Secretary of the Federal Council in America. Cloth, 5 x 7½. Pp. 266. Price \$1.00 net.

The full title of this volume accurately describes its contents; but its value is far greater than is apparent. The history of each one of the thirty denominations is

written by a representative of his Church and is, therefore, in a measure authoritative. There are several valuable statistical tables. The principles and functions of the Council are also briefly presented. It would be well for the clergy to possess this book in order that they may inform themselves concerning a movement which has interested millions of Christian people.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER 1916.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH HISTORY PURE AND APPLIED.*

BY REV. PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

The aim of the Theological Seminary, I understand, is to prepare men to minister the Gospel of Christ. That is its sole purpose and all of its workings must contribute to that end. Of this fact I am not unmindful when I take up the task of teaching Church History in this Seminary. I propose to keep in mind first and last the primary and fundamental purpose of a Theological Seminary, namely, the specific equipment of students for the Gospel Ministry. To that determining purpose the study of Church History must make some essential contribution. This is a very practical consideration.

But there is another thought that insists on making itself felt in this connection. This is an educational institution. It is a Theological Seminary. It is the home of the theological sciences. Now there is such a charm about that word "science" these days that when a person takes up the study or the teaching of a new branch of knowledge he can scarcely avoid looking at it first of all in its abstract scientific aspect. Is Church History a

* An address delivered by Doctor Wentz in the Seminary Chapel, September 21, 1916, on the occasion of his inauguration as Professor of Historical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

science in the true sense of that term? If it is not, it has no place in an educational institution. Is Church History a theological science? If it is not, it has no place in an institution of learning that calls itself a Theological Seminary. But can Church History be presented from the Lutheran point of view and yet remain a science? If it cannot, it can constitute no integral part of the curriculum of a Lutheran Theological Seminary. Such are some of the theoretical considerations that suggest themselves.

These two lines of thought are preliminary to the actual beginning of the work in this department of Historical Theology. The one line has to do with the theoretical aspect of our subject, *Church History as a Theological Science*. The other has to do with the more practical aspect of the subject, *Church History as a Seminary Study*. Let us consider them briefly in their order. For such a discussion, it seems to me, will indicate to you, Mr. President of the Board of Directors, to you my esteemed colleagues of the Faculty, and to you my fellow students,—to you and to the Church whose interests we serve it will indicate in a broad way how I conceive of my mission here and what I hope to accomplish.

First, then,

CHURCH HISTORY AS A THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE.

Its Scientific Character.

Every subject presented in any school of learning should be presented scientifically. That is to say, it should constitute a distinct object of study, a distinct field of investigation; and its content should be made up of knowledge that has been gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking and has been systematized and formulated with reference to the operation of general laws and the discovery of general truths. A well-ordered curriculum today has no more room for superstition than it has for superstition, no more room for fancies than it has for phantoms. Each of its parts must be a science both in its methods and in its content.

Now a theological seminary is an educational institution, a school. No matter whether you regard it as a preparatory school, as a university, as an appendage to the college, as a post-graduate school, as a vocational school, or as a professional school,—it is a school. It deals therefore with sciences, specifically in this case the theological sciences. Among the theological sciences found in the curriculum of all theological seminaries is the subject of Church History. This branch of study must be able, therefore, to assert and maintain both its theological character and its scientific character. Only so is it able to justify its name and its place.

In what sense, then, may Church History be regarded as a theological science and with what grace may it take a place among the other theological sciences? We can perhaps best define Church History as a theological science by differentiating it from another science very familiar to us in its scientific character and very closely related to Church History, namely, General History. General History as a science we know. Its place in a cultural training and its necessity in certain vocational training is uncontested. Like many other sciences it is in theory an exact science but in practice falls far below that and is therefore much more than an exact science. It is comparatively young as a strict science and like most other sciences it is constantly broadening its scope, increasing its content, multiplying its aims, and improving its methods. So that General History is today fully recognized as a science and occupies a place of dignity among the other mental and social sciences.

I have just completed seven years of teaching General History in the College. When now I turn to the teaching of Church History the question naturally forces itself upon me, What is the relation between these two neighbors? The answer to that question will enable us to see both the theological and the scientific character of our subject.

What is the relation between General History and Church History? It would seem to be a very easy answer to the question to say that Church History is simply one

aspect of General History and is related to General History as species to genus, as sub-division to main topic. Now it is true that General History does include the history of the Christian Church; it does embrace within itself the history of religion and the history of religious agencies and ecclesiastical institutions. We no longer distinguish history as "sacred" and "profane." For General History has long since ceased to be a mere narrative of political events, the reigns of kings and the duration of wars, and under the title of *Kulturgeschichte* has come to embrace every sphere of human activity and every field of human interest. It analyzes civilization into all its constituent elements and sets forth the history of each element. It traces the intimate habits of men and the multiform institutions of nations. Not the least of these habits and institutions is religion. And so it is that religion and the Church are thoroughly comprehended in General History today. They are the objects of general historical investigation. But to say for that reason that Church History is only a longitudinal section of General History or the History of Civilization falls short of the truth and is wholly inadequate for our purpose. For such a definition completely robs Church History of its theological character and forever forbids it to stand upon its own feet as a separate and independent science.

No, the solution is not so simple. If Church History consisted merely of certain paragraphs extracted from the pages of General History, then Church History might indeed be a science,—it *might*—but it would certainly not be a theological science and it would be utterly unworthy of the dignified name of Historical Theology. It is possible to present the history of the Christian Church and the history of the Christian Religion without entering the sphere of the theological sciences at all, but such a treatment would be as inadequate as a history of painting by a weaver of canvas or a history of sculpture by a quarrier. Simple justice to the subject demands that Church History preserve its distinctive character as a theological science with all that this entails. And if Church History is to be presented as a theological science, distinct from

the science of General History, there must be a difference not merely in the scope of the material it embraces, not merely in the number of pages covered, but there must be a difference above all in point of view.

But how can we speak of the "point of view" of a subject without forfeiting its scientific character? Must not every real science utterly eliminate every presupposition and every personal equation whatsoever? Does it not conflict with the very idea of genuine science if we start out with any theological assumptions however general and harmless they may seem to be? Are not all modern sciences as impartial in the search for truth as a photographic negative and as blind to the consequences of truth as Justice herself? In theory, yes; in practice, no. We know now that in all observation and experiment and in many inductions it is absolutely impossible to eliminate the personal equation, impossible to avoid a point of view, and practically no science is without its presuppositions.

Certainly the science of History is not without its assumptions and presuppositions. The historian of civilization even with the best of intentions cannot maintain strict objectivity if he performs his full duty to his subject. In the ascertainment of facts, it is true, the purely empirical, the purely objective-critical method is sufficient. And, indeed, that method of investigating the facts is demanded in the interest of modern inductive science. But that is not enough. To determine the facts of history and set them down in the order of their occurrence is not the sole occupation of the historian. Nor is it his most important task. The historian is much more than a mere annalist. To relate occurrences, to describe conditions, to set forth the consecution of events, is only the beginning of the historian's work. If his duties were limited to research and narrative it might indeed be possible in this way to describe history and to narrate history, but it would certainly not be possible by this method alone to *understand* history. Man is much more than the sum of his classifiable operations. Far more important therefore than the ascertaining of the facts is the task of explaining the world-process out of the mass of

historical materials. The chaos of details must be resolved into an orderly whole. The historian must draw perspectives and serve as an interpreter in terms of human reason. By dint of varying emphasis, by the turn of his index finger, he must point out the high places and call attention to symptomatic tendencies. To do this he must pass beyond the simplicity of empirical objectivity and so-called impartiality and must go on to apply standards of judgment to human happenings. He must indicate the trends of events and the trains of consequences and he must form estimates of value.

But as soon as he leaves the narrow sphere of individual facts and casts his view upon the totality of events the historian cannot fail to enter the sphere of the subjective and then it is that his personal "point of view" comes into play. He must make assumptions. The very effort itself to understand the meaning of history as a whole proceeds on the assumption, the metaphysical assumption, that the activities of the human spirit constitute a unity and a continuity down the ages. The effort to comprehend the world-process would be utterly meaningless and futile without that assumption. Modern historical method requires a metaphysics of history which posits a progress of the human race. What the standard of that human progress is depends in each case upon the point of view of the historian and many are the personal factors that thus enter into the telling of the story, many the colors that may be combined in the making of the picture. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the "point of view" is a very important factor in determining the method of procedure and the product of investigation in historical science.

Now the main point of difference between General History and Church History is just here in the general point of view. There is no essential difference in the nature and extent of their materials, for all the facts of universal history concern the Church Historian. Their methods are much the same, for the visible Church is no enchanted ground on which we are exempt from the laws of evidence and common sense and so the Church Histo-

rian must proceed critically. He must decipher his authorities and study their thoughts and feelings in the same way as other historians, and if the Lives of mediaeval saints are no more reliable as sources of truth than the letters of modern diplomats, neither are they any less reliable. The purpose of the two kinds of historians is very similar, for the Church historian, like the political or the constitutional historian or the economic historian who is such a favorite nowadays, must sift out his facts and trace a certain line of growth. In many respects, therefore, the two sciences are not unlike. In scope of materials, in systematic procedure, in critical method, in verifying conclusions by exact observation, and in formulating results with reference to general truths, they are very similar.

But there remains the broad difference in point of view. This is important for our subject. The representative of General History in relating the history of civilization assumes the continuity of the human mind and an orderliness of human nature and he proceeds to set forth the development of the human race and its progress towards its goal of subduing the world and bringing forth an ideal humanity. The Church Historian makes no larger assumption than that. He remains therefore just as strictly within the bounds of pure science as the writer of General History. But the movement which Church History depicts has a different goal from that which General History depicts. For while General History deals with the progress of the human race in realizing its ideals, Church History on the other hand deals with the coming of the Kingdom of God in the Church of Jesus Christ. In General History the individual is regarded as a unit in the organism of mankind; in Church History he is viewed as a unit in the communion of saints. This is the chief distinction between the two sciences. Granted the difference in point of view the scientific character of both goes unchallenged. Church History therefore is a science, an independent science. It is as complete in itself as any other of the social sciences. Its character of independence is not forfeited by its religious

point of view, because that very point of view redeems it from subserviency to the science of General History and assigns to it its own field of investigation.

Its Theological Character.

The theological character of the science of Church History can be explained also by contrast with General History. It grows out of the difference in the assumptions made by the two sciences.

As General History assumes the freedom of human personality so Church History assumes divine revelation. As the natural sciences proceed on the assumption that the physical universe constitutes a closed aggregate of forces and that all physical events are the issue of natural causes immanent somehow in the physical universe, so the science of History proceeds on the assumption that human nature is essentially uniform in the possession of personality and free will and that the actions and interactions of these personal agents constitute a progressive and methodical advance towards a world-goal, and so the science of Church History proceeds on the assumption that the redemptory work of Christ constituted a new beginning in the religious experience of the race and that the spirit of Christ rules in the Christian Church as the motive-power of new life which grows from more to more both in the individual and in the community.

These assumptions are different in kind but they are the same in degree. Belief in the Gospel is no more a prejudice, no more unscientific, than unbelief. As it is impossible to get a real understanding of the history of civilization if we proceed upon mere analogies to physical events, so it is impossible to gain an adequate understanding of the history of the Church if we regard it merely as the natural result of the development of the race. Fundamental and indispensable to our science is the assumption of a supernatural factor, the agency and the product of revelation. Essential to its intelligent treatment is the unshakable conviction of the transcendent importance of the Gospel as the clue to all history.

This means faith. The Church of Christ, its origin, its being, its completion, is an article of faith. And therein lies the theological character of our science. Church History is theology. And so long as theology is not dissolved into the general science of religion, Church History will not be lost on the pages of General History or crowded out by the other social sciences but will remain a theological science secure and independent.

Its Confessional Character.

Now if Church History is theology, the Church Historian must be a theologian. He must be a theologian at least in the sense that he must take a position with reference to the theological problem. The theological sciences as a group are naturally centered in systematic theology, which is the scientific conception and systematic disposition of the given facts in Christianity, the Bible, the Church, and Christian experience. And the attitude of the individual theologian on questions of systematic or dogmatic theology will as a matter of course be an important factor in determining the spirit in which he prosecutes his own science. To this rule Church History is no exception. The doctrinal position of the Church Historian is of tremendous significance both for his investigation and for his presentation of his subject.

This could be abundantly illustrated from the writings of Church Historians whose works are familiar to you. One, like Gieseler, measures everything with the insipid standards of rationalism and never really reaches the spiritual marrow of the Church. The negative effect of this attitude is apparent in spite of his best efforts at impartiality, for he presents nothing but a skeleton of dry bones, cold, lifeless, tedious. Others, like Neander and his disciple Philip Schaff, view the history of the Church as a continuous revelation of Christ's presence and power in humanity. Their accounts reflect the warm glow of their own evangelical piety and they set before us the history of the Christian Church as a living organism, sympathetic, attractive, full of life and heart.

The personal attitude of the workman does have a great deal to do with the product of his labors. A certain predisposition is necessary for the successful treatment of any subject. Men and events may be *described* out of cold knowledge, but neither men nor events can be *understood* without sympathy and imagination. We should hardly expect a discriminating biography of Beethoven from one who has no music in his soul. We should scarcely expect an adequate account of the history of religion from an irreligious or atheistic person. The history of Christianity from the pen of an avowed Buddhist or Mohammedan might be interesting as literature but it would certainly not be satisfying as history. A worthy account of the life of Christ can come only from one who has felt in his own life the grip of Christ's power and is conscious of personal piety towards the subject of his narrative. Likewise the history of the Christian Church can be properly set forth only by one who is in intimate sympathy with the life of the Christian Church, her ideals and her spirit. Even apart from his intellectual assent to the general assumption of a divine revelation the Church Historian must be a live Christian. He must recognize the supernatural factor, the operation of the spirit of Christ, not only in the beginning of the Church but also in her progress down the centuries. This is a positive definite predisposition that the Church Historian cannot dispense with if his subject is to be a theological science.

Then, too, within the broad circle of positive Christianity, doctrinal and ecclesiastical choices are necessary. It is sometimes said that the profession of the Church Historian is the most convenient profession among the theological branches, because it is thought that the writing and teaching of Church History does not call for a decided position on mooted questions of doctrine and practice. In other words, it is argued that the Church Historian has less to do with controversy, is less liable to be afflicted with theological rabies, than other theologians. That sort of argument usually proceeds from persons who are themselves without strong convictions.

But I am inclined to feel that in most cases theological rabies is to be preferred to theological lock-jaw. At any rate, whether it is desirable or not, it is a fact that the specialist in Church History cannot avoid theological presuppositions either in his investigation or in his presentation. The Church Historian who thinks he can by virtue of his specialty clothe himself in the comfortable cloak of pure scientific objectivity deceives himself and the truth is not in him. No, whoever tries to present the history of the Christian Religion, the history of the Church in general, or the history of any Church in particular, must form judgments. He must take positions. His own comfort cannot dictate. Asbestos might indeed be a useful material with which to surround one's self in times of fiery controversy, but asbestos is not a useful material from which to make working clothes. The non-committal asbestine historian may consider himself comfortable by virtue of his aloofness but in his secure indifference he is not properly clothed for the full accomplishment of his whole duty.

The doctrinal position of the Church Historian, his attitude towards the theological problem, is important not merely for the general deductions that he makes from his data, not merely for the conclusions that he draws at the close of his investigations, but it is important at the very beginning and throughout the course of his work. It is of importance not only in determining his definition of his subject which fixes his conception of his task but also in determining the special field of his inquiry. What is the essence of Christianity? And what is the Christian Church? These questions must be answered before the work of the Church Historian can proceed. It is a mistake to suppose that they can be answered in the course of the historical investigation. No, the historian must have a clear idea of his subject before he begins to prosecute it. But no one has ever yet answered these questions about the essence of Christianity and the marks of the Christian Church without thereby indicating his theological position.

The same is true with reference to the great branches

of the Christian Church, Protestantism and Catholicism. Define the essence of each and you disclose your personal attitude towards them. In the face of these two conceptions of Christianity, so fundamentally divergent, it is simply impossible for the Church Historian to maintain complete impartiality. It is greatly to be regretted that this difference in confessional position has so often led not merely to a difference in historical evaluation but even to a difference in questions of the facts themselves. Nevertheless, in view of what has already been said, we Protestants must, I think, recognize the *scientific* right of a history of Christianity from the Catholic point of view. And where such history is prosecuted by strict scientific methods, and not merely for polemical reasons, more is accomplished in the end than can possibly result from the barren, spineless offerings of the historian who is incapable of forming a judgment or is unwilling to express one.

Moreover, even within the various branches of Protestantism, the Church Historian can scarcely avoid the influence of his doctrinal and ecclesiastical position if his work is to be carried on as a theological science. However much the various Protestant confessions may agree among themselves in all the essential articles of faith, the differences among them are not merely speculative and academic but they are of a religious and practical nature. These differences affect the entire circle of theology, interpretation, organization, worship, and practical piety. Differences in dogmatic theology involve differences in all the other sciences of the theological group. The effects of this are felt by the Church Historian in his work, and these effects are evident in the products of his labors.

In the first place, in these days of specialization, the confessional interest of the historian is one of the most important factors in determining the particular field of his detailed research. The hands and the mind naturally busy themselves with the object that lies close to the heart. And this personal interest equips the eye with optical apparatus which enables it to see facts and relations that would remain completely hidden but for the

dogmatic interest. Sharpened vision is not necessarily fancy or prejudice: it is a legitimate instrument for the discovery of truth.

Then, too, the confessional interest of the Church Historian helps to determine his attitude on fundamental problems. The definition he gives of Church and Sacraments, the relative position he assigns to the Person and Work of Christ in the history of doctrines, the emphasis he places upon the work of different individuals, the importance he ascribes to certain events and movements in history, his division of the history of the Church into periods and epochs, and above all his evaluation of general tendencies and his deduction of general truths,—these and many other things will be affected by his confessional position. This is necessarily so and it is not to be deprecated. The impartial historian is not the historian who has no convictions, nor the historian who conceals his convictions by refusing to express opinions, but the historian who has formed his convictions by a single-hearted effort to be true to events by living them over again and to be true to the lives of men by thinking their thoughts after them and by understanding their whole environment. Convictions that have been formed by this impartial method cannot fail to enter into the narrative in terms of sympathy or antipathy. They will of necessity color the narrative. And this can be done with strict pedagogical propriety and without for a moment violating the quality of our subject as a theological science. This is the justification for treating Church History as a theological science, the warrant for teaching Historical Theology from the confessional stand-point. Just that is my commission.

For I am asked today to pledge myself to aid in carrying out the design of this Seminary. That design is stated to be the educating of men for the Christian Ministry and the providing of our Churches with "pastors who sincerely believe the Word of God as contained in the Old and New Testaments to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and who hold the Augsburg Confession to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doc-

trines of the Divine Word.” And I am asked to declare for myself that I “believe the Scriptures to be the inspired Word of God” and that I believe “the Augsburg Confession and the Smaller Catechism of Luther to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God,” and so to teach. This I do *ex animo*. By birth and by choice, by training and by experience, by native disposition and by reasoned conviction, I confess myself a Lutheran. Otherwise I should not undertake to teach Historical Theology in a Lutheran Theological Seminary. For I realize, as I have indicated, that the confessional position of the teacher, even the teacher of Historical Theology, is not without serious influence upon the results of his labors.

I propose, therefore, to treat the theological science of Church History as an integral part of the curriculum in a Lutheran Theological Seminary and in a way that will be consistent with the well-known theological and confessional position of this institution. Our widest field is the history of religion. Our particular field is the history of the Christian Church, the Church of the divine and living Christ. And our special field of study and interpretation is the Lutheran Church, her genesis, her development, her work.

We turn now to a more practical consideration, namely,

CHURCH HISTORY AS A SEMINARY STUDY.

We are concerned here not about methods but about results. If the purpose of the Seminary is to prepare men for the Gospel Ministry and if every branch of study in the Seminary curriculum must contribute to that purpose, the question may be raised, How does the study of Historical Theology constitute a part of a man's equipment for the preaching and pastoral office and wherein does Church History aid in the cure of souls. Granting that our subject goes beyond the knowledge of bare facts and rises to the loftier sphere of pure science, it yet remains to show that it is also an applied art and has practical value as a Seminary study.

It would be impossible here to indicate all the practical uses of Church History. The immense cultural effect of all historical study can scarcely be over-estimated, but it does not call for consideration here. What a vast storehouse of rich homiletical treasures the history of the Church affords to the preacher, abounding as it does in sermonic material, in eloquent theme, and in pointed illustration, it may be left to the Department of Homiletics to indicate. What a fund of valuable instruction it furnishes the pastor, holding before him as it does the wisdom and the experience of the ages and the example of our fathers who have not labored in vain,—this may be left to the Department of Pastoral Theology to point out. What an effective instrument of doctrinal discipline it places in the hands of the student, expounding as it does the creeds of the Church like the history of a country expounds its constitution and dissolving as it does abstract doctrines in the alembic of concrete life like Christ dissolved his teachings in parables,—this may be left to the Department of Dogmatic Theology to set forth. Suffice it to say here that the main practical value of Church History as a Seminary study has reference to the general spirit which it begets or fosters within the life and heart of the student.

The chief point of usefulness in modern historical study is not to please our fancy, nor to gratify our curiosity, nor to test our memories, nor even to add to our stock of information and provide a fund of convenient precedents, but to help us to understand ourselves and our fellow-men and the problems and prospects of mankind. General History teaches the individual to understand himself as a unit in the organism of humanity, to realize his position as an heir of the ages and as a factor in present-day civilization. So Church History seeks to help the individual to understand himself as a unit in the great Church of Christ, to realize his position as an heir of eternal spiritual values and as a factor in the Kingdom of God. The individual who so understands himself will be very vitally and practically influenced in

his attitude towards men and things. His entire temper and disposition will be affected.

There are many qualities of temperament, many lines of disposition, which the study of Church history tends to cultivate. I have chosen to indicate here only three of them.

First, there is

The Spirit of Loyalty.

Devotion to a righteous cause is always deepened by information about that cause. Zeal must be tempered with knowledge if it is to be healthful. The person whose allegiance to Christ and to the Church is not rooted and grounded in thorough-going knowledge of Christ and the Church, in penetrative understanding of the spirit of Christ as it has manifested itself in the history of the Church,—such a person might be a legalist in his devotion, he could scarcely be regarded as a loyalist. He might do what he is told, breaking no rules but keeping faith with the word that is written and can be read. But there is a devotion that goes much further than that, a devotion that grows out of vital touch with the very spirit and purpose of Christ as it has unfolded itself in the life of the Church through the centuries. This is the kind of devotion that far transcends the mere statute and tradition of Christian living and calls forth service up to the very limit of ability. This is the spirit of loyalty that can be counted on to accomplish the purpose even where the letter fails, the spirit that applies perspective and moulds the means in each case in accordance with the ultimate purpose that is to be served. This spirit, begotten in large measure by the historical sense, calls for qualities of intelligence, alertness, resourcefulness. And this means leadership.

That the history of the Church should be the means of stimulating loyalty to Christ and to the Church is a part of God's own plan. This is evident in His dealings with the Hebrews. Right wondrously Jehovah wrought for Israel, delivering them from friends and foes, leading

them through deep waters, sustaining them on the desert, and providing them with laws and leaders and goodly habitations. And then the covenant of God made provision that the memory of those mighty deeds should never depart from their minds to all generations. To that end it was commanded that the children should always be carefully instructed in the history of those deeds. Memorial pillars were erected. Memorial statutes were enacted. And, above all, memorial feasts were instituted. Thus the wonderful dealings of God became household stories for all time to come. The result was that Israel's literature rang with the note of intense patriotism, and Israel remained a separate people as the depository of true religion and from time to time renewed her devotion to her mission by drinking at the fountain of the memory of her past. God used the pages of history as one of the means to accomplish his purpose with that people.

Now the annals of the Church of Christ are not bare of the marvels of God. God is still in the midst of his people. The Church of the New Dispensation has had her deep waters to cross and her dreadful deserts to pass through. She has had her songs of triumph and she has had an inheritance far fairer than Canaan. She has been saved from her friends and delivered from her foes. She has had her great leaders, she has seen the cloud of fire, and she is about to receive the nations of the earth for her inheritance. If the heart of the Hebrew could thrill with the story of his nation's past and could find in the narrative of that story the source of patriotic zeal, should not the Christian of today find in the grander and more wonderful life-story of his Church the deep springs of a yet more profound loyalty and devotion?

One of the most effectual means employed by the various nations of the earth today in order to inculcate the quality of patriotism in their citizens is the diligent teaching of the nation's history in all the public schools of the land. In times past when the national consciousness has been at a low ebb far-seeing statesmen have inaugurated projects for the diligent study of the national history. This has invariably resulted in a quickening of devotion

to the national interests. Not the smallest factor in forming union sentiment in our own country just before the Civil War was the great interest in the study of our country's history. This interest was at once the cause and the effect of the many worthy narratives of the life of the nation which date from that period.

But history is the mother of ecclesiastical devotion as well as political patriotism. No one can ponder the glorious triumphs of the Cross, the marvelous progress of the Church, the heroic march of her noble army, without taking increased devotion to the great Head of the Church and renewed zeal to her sublime purpose. No one who looks at the Christian Church in the perspective of the ages can dissolve his loyalty or bow his head in discouragement because of the conflagration that is now raging among the Christian nations of Europe, for he knows that the Church has survived horrors far more direful than that and he has the confident assurance that the gates of Mars shall not prevail against her. Christ will triumph. The history of the Church is the unfolding of his purpose. And in an age of increasing indifference of spirit towards the Church we cannot afford to neglect this very potent influence for the arousing of Church loyalty.

What is true of the Christian Church at large is true of the Lutheran Church in particular. Ours is indeed a goodly heritage as a Church and we cannot afford to ignore it. We have a past of which we may well be proud, an honorable past replete with saving principles and associated with cherished memories of godly and heroic fathers. A deepening interest in the history of our Church always means an increase in loyalty to the Church. That is a matter of experience. More than once men have been recovered from un-Lutheran views and healed of un-Lutheran attitudes simply by studying the history of the venerable Church to which they belong. And this applies to the communion as well as to the individual. Ours is pre-eminently a historical Church. It is impossible to catch the spirit of our confession or to appreciate our heritage, impossible to understand the real

genius of our Church, except by a sympathetic knowledge of her history.

What we need, therefore, is that our Lutheran Church in all her parts may experience a vigorous development of her own historic life. With the recovery of the historical sense our Church would begin to assert herself more boldly as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America and would become more conscious of a special mission of her own in our present day. A clearer knowledge of our past in its bearing upon the present, and the conscious effort to preserve the historic landmarks as a distinctive Lutheranism, would mean a revival of Church loyalty, an increased denominational zeal, and a renewed activity in all the practical tasks of Christian love.

It is clear, then, that Church History as a Seminary study cultivates a healthful, chastened spirit of loyalty. And what can be a greater practical asset to a minister of the Gospel than wholesome loyalty and intelligent enthusiasm for Christ, for the Bible, and for his Church?

Then, too, there is

The Spirit of Conservatism.

A proper historical perspective begets a healthful spirit of conservatism. And here it must be emphasized that there is a true and a false spirit of conservatism. There is a spirit of conservatism which means reaction and stagnation and isolation. This is the spirit that has produced the Romish and the Greek types of the Church. Then there is a spirit of conservatism which does not exclude progress but which opposes itself to revolution and radicalism and which seeks simply to secure the present by being true to the results of the past. This is the true spirit of conservatism and it is characterized by a due reverence for history, by moderation of manner, patience of spirit and sobriety of tone. For the precipitance of revolution it substitutes the sober judgment of reformation. For the violence of radicalism it prefers the sober means of steady progressiveness. It does not venerate

the old merely for its antiquity, nor does it reject the new merely for its novelty, but it proves all things and holds fast that which is good.

Just this is the spirit that is begotten by a discriminating study of Church History, the spirit of probity and steadiness. The history of Christianity moves under the influence of that spirit. The world moves slowly but steadily. The Church of Christ moves slowly but steadily. The whole science of history warns against revolution both of theory and of practice. Sudden, swift changes, quick movements in history, are dangerous and are unlikely to produce lasting wholesome effects. True, it sometimes occurs that an abrupt change takes place in a single institution or in a single individual or in a single habit of an individual. But an abrupt general change is unknown to history. There are rare cases in which an individual, through accident or through sudden change of environment or through affliction of terrible disease, is fundamentally transformed in a short lapse of time. But these cases are most exceptional. For there is a tenacious continuity of personality and if all the habits and interests of the individual are examined it will be found that very rarely are any great number of them altered suddenly. Now society is far more conservative even than the individual, for reasons that are obvious. The complexity of human affairs has brought it about that the history of every constructive forward movement in society is the history of slow growth. Real, permanent progress comes only gradually, by almost insensible gradations. As nature abhors a vacuum, and as life abhors a leap, so history seems to abhor cataclysmic transformations. History knows no isolated great events. The Reformation was "due" when it arrived. The French Revolution had long been preparing when it took place. Even such an individual and apparently independent event as the discovery of America cannot be regarded as isolated or absolute.

Likewise, the religious and ecclesiastical situation at any particular time is the outgrowth of past events plus present personalities, and it cannot be correctly under-

stood or properly dealt with apart from the light of the past. I do not mean to say that we can always apply past experience to the complete solution of current problems. That would be as unwise as to view our present problems with obsolete emotions or to attempt their solution with obsolete reasoning. But I do mean to say that the *foundations* of right conduct are always the same and that the spirit of conservatism, or historical-mindedness, is the only guarantee of rational progress. One foundation has been laid from eternity and realized in history, and better foundation than this can no man lay. If the temple of Christian living is to be made more pure and beautiful than it has been hitherto, the wood and the hay and the stubble must be removed, but the gold and the silver and the precious stones of the former structure must be retained, and the new edifice must be erected upon the same old foundation which has survived all the storms of the past and has remained constant through the ages.

As for each one of us, our memory makes the experiences of our lives cumulative and fills us with a desire to conserve the good things of yesterday so that we do not need to begin life over again with each succeeding moment of time, so the historical sense makes us the heirs of a venerable past and fills us with a spirit of conservatism so that we do not need to drag out our lives on the stationary frontiers of Christian grace as though the saints had never lived but conserving our spiritual heritage may use it to equip ourselves for new conquests. This is a very real factor in the practical temperamental equipment of preacher and pastor.

Finally, there is

The Spirit of Progressiveness.

The prospect to the future is in practice even more important than the retrospect of the past. Hope is a stronger enchantress of the heart than memory is. Now the soul of history is the spirit of progress, and this is of the very essence of hope.

Nothing is more conspicuous about modern historical

treatises than the doctrine of the continuity of history. It is this doctrine that distinguishes history as a science from history as mere literature. Time was, little more than half a century ago, when the historian labored chiefly to find out exactly how things had been. There was no effort to determine how things had come about. The motive of the historian was mainly literary or moral and his object was to entertain, edify or comfort the reader. Such was history before the middle of the nineteenth century.

Today the main interest in historical study is the genetical interest. And the great task of the historian is not merely to describe what once was but to show how it came to be. Modern civilization is very complex and in order to understand ourselves in relation to our times we need to know the source of each element in our civilization, where and how it entered the stream of history, and how it combined with other elements. The modern man has a lively consciousness of the reality and the inevitability of change and he is filled with a desire to know the whence and the whither of events.

Now it is an observed fact that every institution of man, every useful idea, every important event, is but the outgrowth of a long line of progress, extending back as far as we care to trace it. This observation has begotten the doctrine of the continuity of history and this in turn has raised history to the dignity of a science. The developmental treatment has come to be the accepted one in nearly all the sciences. In the science of history this means that the present stage of human development must in each case be viewed as a cross-section in the organic process of man's constant advance. The lines of progress lead not merely from past to present but from the past through the present to the future. Thus the scientific study of history turns the face of the student towards the wide expanse of the days that lie before.

This idea of the unity and the continuity of history begets an exhilarating spirit of progressiveness. The world may move slowly, nevertheless it *does* move. Changes for the better may be very gradual in their pro-

cess, nevertheless such changes are constantly taking place. And the reformer of today does not seek his sanction in the past but in the future. He attacks existing evils not by pointing to "the good old times" but by pointing to the vast possibilities of human progress. And these possibilities who can measure? The process of the creation of the world is still going on. The human race is still in its infancy. The Christian Church has only begun her career. And ours is a tremendous responsibility to move forward. The so-called modern world possesses a tremendous wealth of knowledge, the heritage of the ages, and a wide experience of its own. But all this must be regarded only as a vantage ground from which to start into the future with its limitless tasks and possibilities. It is not true that history repeats itself. There may be constantly recurring cycles of formation, deformation, reformation, but the general trend of the cycles themselves is forward and each synthesis is a new thesis. Each age is clearly conscious of original tasks belonging to itself alone. We are the heirs of a great historical whole to which we must make some contribution. This thought stimulates energy and begets a sense of responsibility.

Now just as General History is the progressive development of the idea of humanity, so the history of the Church is the progressive development of the idea of Christianity. God's work is progressive not only in the development of humanity in general but also in the origin and growth of his special Kingdom. Revelation has been gradual and progressive, because it has been constantly adapted to the capacity of man. From the beginning God has been working an ever widening work, and through the ages there runs a single increasing purpose. That purpose began with the foundation of the world, it came into human view in the centuries of Israel's history, it centered in the life and death of Christ, it entered upon a new stage at Pentecost, and until this very moment it has been constantly increasing and unfolding.

The forward movement of the Church of Christ has never ceased despite its obstructions and retrogressions.

She still moves on to cover the earth and to pervade, transform, and sanctify humanity. As the individual Christian is moving forward in an unceasing process of sanctification, in a progressive understanding and application of the Gospel to his own heart, so the Church of Christ moves ever onward and upward to the supreme climax of a world-wide Gospel and a world-wide sway of Christ the King. To see this progressive movement with clear vision and to realize one's personal responsibility as a unit in the expanding organism of the Church and in the increasing purpose of God,—this is one of the most wholesome practical results that can be hoped for from the study of Church History. For it entails all the good qualities of life and temperament that are bound up with an enlightened spirit of hopefulness and progressiveness.

The spirit of Christian progressiveness is the necessary balance to the spirit of conservatism. Without this spirit of progressiveness the spirit of conservatism would mean paralysis and stagnation. It would mean reaction rather than advance. The two qualities of temperament complement each other and both are essential to the genuine success of preacher and pastor. In the Lutheran Church a progressive conservatism means a wholesome spirit of aggression and an ever increasing vigor of life, a life that avoids what is partisan and feverish on the one hand but on the other hand avoids fossilization and degeneration by sloughing off mere dead traditions and antiquated methods and by making a vigorous enlightened application of our own ecclesiastical heritage to the special tasks to today.

ARTICLE II.

CHARGE TO DR. ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.¹

BY REV. E. D. WEIGLE, D.D.

By virtue of my office as president of the Board of Directors, I have the honor of speaking the message to you denominated a charge. You, my brother, come to this service, in our beloved Seminary, in the enthusiasm and energy of youth, with well trained powers, with an experience of years in somewhat similar work in our College. You take up the work in response to the unanimous choice of its Board of Directors, and at a time when the opportunity is most favorable for telling work in your department. In response to the call of the hour, especial emphasis being laid upon historical studies these days, the resignation of Prof. Kuhlman, for thirteen years the incumbent of the chair of Biblical Theology opening the way for a readjustment of the Seminary curriculum, the chair of Historical Theology, in a distinctive sense, was created. This was done in the interest of harmonious arrangement of the various departments of study, and that the important branches of Church History, History of Doctrine, Missions, History of Religion might receive the attention due them. By thus rearranging and co-ordinating the work of your chair, the other departments become more harmonious and enjoy unity of endeavor. The work of the chair of Biblical Theology, never clearly defined, was distributed, as harmony of studies suggested and permitted.

The various departments of Church History have not merely an external and mechanical, but an organic relation to each other, and form one living whole. This relation the historian must show and the teacher of history

¹ Delivered as President of the Board of Directors of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., on the occasion of the inauguration of Rev. Abdel Ross Wentz. Ph. D., as Professor of Historical Theology, September 21st, 1916

should emphasize. The study of history, both sacred and secular, has assumed new or, at least, added importance in recent years. It has become an essential, in the sphere of broadest scholarship, that history in its most comprehensive sense, be known and applied as a test of what is thought, professed and taught. If this be not done, much of claimed history will impose itself upon us. True history reveals God working mainly through consecrated personality, highly cultured genius, in the power of truth, spirit-quickenened. In the history of the Church we have no absentee Christ, even if He is enthroned above the skies, for He ascended and took His throne that He might fill all things. As the great head of the Church He is making history from His throne in the agency of the spirit, in and through, the truth adown the centuries through the instrumentality of His body, the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. It is a great thing to be set for the defense of the truth, as an instructor of those who are looking forward to the ministry of reconciliation. In a humble way it will be your privilege to magnify your office and your high calling.

Touching the essentials of success in your work we may remark that it will be necessary for you to know yourself in your capabilities, attainments, and limitations as well. It will be highly important to know your pupils in order that you may deal with them justly, and individually and with regard to their varied capabilities, attainments and limitations. It will be absolutely essential for you to know the subject or subjects you are to teach. This will challenge constant and unremitting study, fidelity in imparting and drawing out, in order to keenest and purest mental discipline. It will, doubtless be your constant aim to so meet the demands of the task set you as to call forth the best that is in you; to encourage your students to the best possible in application, research, and persistent study in the mastery of things; to enthuse them in a way that the mastery of the subject in hand will fascinate and charm to the utmost endeavor and progress; to so instruct by the most improved methods, and move and marshall all the powers of thought, that the result will be students

on the road to broadest scholarship and intensest service. Rightly to know your relationship to those under your care, will reveal a responsibility which will oppress you, and an exaltation which will, at times, bewilder you. It is a most responsible thing to be a sharer with others, as co-laborers with God, in preparing young men to become ambassadors for Christ in making known the salvation of God to a perishing world. It is, also, a privilege which outvies that of angels for whilst they minister to the heirs of salvation, the redeemed, in co-operation with God, mediate, in a secondary, representative way the salvation of God itself to willing, trusting hearts even unto the ends of the earth. Who can estimate the work accomplished by this school of the prophets, by the more than eleven hundred men sent forth from within its walls into the Church and the world, the well-trained, safely guided and duly accredited ambassadors of the King whose conquering reign of years and truth shall encompass the world? It is a great thing to be an ambassador of such a King and of such a far-reaching kingdom. To the task of training such ambassadors in the history of the kingdom, you have been called. This is a work into which angels desire to look, but which has been delegated to men to do.

Touching the method of instruction it should be remarked that whilst there is no substitute for the catechetical, in the teaching of most subjects the combination of the lecture method with the catechetical brings the best results. The lecture method only, where the pupil is allowed to be wholly passive, cannot produce the best results. The instructor may lecture ever so well under this filling in process, but the pupil suffers, as he is neither required to study, or be mentally active, in the class-room. A relationship of friendship and unselfish interest is assumed in teacher and thought.

As to the subject matter of your chair, a most inviting field is afforded you for the most assiduous and comprehensive study, and the broadest and safest guidance of those under your care, along the pathways of sanest scholarship. Aristotle termed the highest branch of philosophy, theological. Old Testament Theology has to do with the unfolding of God's gracious purpose in a progressive

revelation in which the cross is indicated in type, shadow and ceremony, until the fulness of the times brings into the joy of realization the new and better covenant in the fact of Jesus Christ, unveiled. Exegetical and Historical Theology furnish the material for Systematic Theology in which clear definition and thorough systematization dominate. Practical Theology directs the use of all theological truth for the conversion of men and their present and eternal salvation. It seeks the right and best application of truth to all the ends for which Christianity has been divinely established in the world. Historical Theology traces the historical development of Christianity in the thought and life of the Church. It takes account especially of God in history. We believe that the changes in the curriculum that have made Historical Theology a separate and undistracted department, along with the readjustment of all departments will mark an epoch in the inner history of our Seminary.

A true education will aim to cultivate in young and old the historical and social imagination. Effort should be put forth to develop in every mind under your direction some appreciation of the past, with its great figures, its story, its song, its struggles, its victories, its mistakes and failures with the hope of projecting into the future a vision of purpose and responsibilities of what is to be realized. This will give hopeful meaning to life, mission and destiny. It will greatly enrich and broaden, as well as deepen, the life of each individual thus trained. In charging you, as president of the Board which has called you to this service, I assume that

1. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the vow you will take, as an instructor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod.

The declaration to which you subscribe today, and which is repeated every five years by each professor, indicates how sacredly the fathers have guarded the teaching in this Seminary. There is no desire, or disposition, on the part of any member of the Board, so far as we know, to have the standard of the time-honored orthodoxy lowered to meet the liberalistic teaching tolerated in some

quarters. You, my brother, will be expected to adhere to the line in defending and maintaining the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrine of that Word.

I assume that

2. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the teachings and cultus of the Lutheran Church of the General Synod.

By this I do not mean that you should teach a Lutheranism which loses sight of the essential oneness of the Lutheran Church, in doctrine, faith and worship, throughout the world, but that you should evermore emphasize the ecumenical character of the Lutheran Church as believed in by the General Synod, the magna charta of whose doctrines, faith and liberties is the venerable and highly-honored Augsburg Confession, as over against any particularistic type of Lutheranism which would array pulpit against pulpit and altar against altar in the same household of faith simply because some matters not essential are lifted into the domain of that which demands credal acceptance and authority. I congratulate you on your coming into this service at the time which is upon us. Your term of service, which we hope may be many years, beginning on the eve of the quadro-centennial of Lutheranism, gives you an opportunity to anchor yourself, if possible, more fully in the evangelic history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, a knowledge of whose return to the simplicity of apostolic Christianity, in bringing an erring Church to the joy of a restored faith, which to a great degree had been lost, is of such supreme importance. The time is ripe for clear and fearless apologetics, grounded on the redemptive purpose revealed by an infallible Bible and the unqualified acceptance of the apostolic watchword so nobly placed into the clearest light by our immortal Luther: "The just shall live by faith." A bold stand on the christo-centric history of Reformation times, is what is called for on the part of our Seminaries, our pulpits and our people. Our Lutheran Church, as no other, must save the day in these perilous times, theologically, and historically.

I assume that

3. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to the demands of the teaching from the stand-point, not of a negative, destructive, but a positive, constructive, character.

The growth of the Church in the knowledge of the infallible Word of God, is a constant struggle against error, misbelief and unbelief; hence the history of heresies is an essential part of the history of doctrine. The work of the Church of Jesus Christ is to construct, to restore, to build up. As the Master Himself said, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." It is the province of Church History to aid in promoting a correct knowledge of God's kingdom on earth, and in setting forth its history as a book of life, a store-house of wisdom and piety, and the surest test of His own promise to His people: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The fact that we are living in a stirring, restless, rushing age of discovery, criticism and reconstruction makes it supremely important that the divine-human basis of the whole structure of history as revealed in the apostolic period, or the ever-living fountain of the unbroken stream of the Church, be known and studied in relation to what *must ever remain* the content of a sane and saving system of truth in the best system of evangelic thought. To strengthen the faith in the immovable historical foundations of Christianity and its victory over the world should be the highest ambition of those who are set for the defense of the truth. The claims of the cults, isms and eccentric, negative teachings, viewed in the light of the thought of the centuries, as recorded and expressed by the faithful, impartial and just historian will not stand the test. As a rule these strange teachings which purport to be new are discovered to be as old as the ages—old heresies dug up and re-asserting themselves, whereas they have been met time and again and were many times buried. "The Gospel," says John William Miller, summing up the final result of his life-long studies in history, "is the fulfillment of all hopes, the perfection

of all philosophy, the interpreter of all resolutions, the key of all seeming contradictions of the physical and moral worlds; it is life—it is immortality.”

I assume finally that

4. You will teach Historical Theology in the light of supreme loyalty to salvation by the grace of God in Christ Jesus and through faith, whose justifying power is the article of a standing or a falling Church.

You will not teach self-salvation, nor salvation by character, nor salvation by the good will you entertain toward your fellowmen. The Biblical way of salvation, and that of evangelical history is, first to be saved by grace through faith, then from the power of the new creation in the heart, love and good will shall flow out from such a soul, spontaneously and gladly toward all one's fellow-beings. Love to God supreme, a sweet experience, love of fellowman as self will be a great reality. Then follow good works, the fruit of the Spirit, as naturally as good lungs breathe and a healthy heart beats. You will not explain and reconstruct history to suit the too prevalent rationalism of today. History truly taught becomes a means to grace. If God in history is a reality it may be thus taught. It is not only designed to keep us from discouraging pessimism, but is calculated to give us a sustained hope. In the light of ecclesiastical history our faith should be enthusiastic and world-overcoming, assured that whatever may take place throughout the centuries of time, at last God and his plan to save the world will be fully vindicated.

We trust you may find the work of your department congenial. The privilege of having a share in training an efficient and adequate ministry to supply the needs of our growing Church is something to be coveted. We bespeak for you many years of service in our beloved Seminary. Almost a century of blessed, self-sacrificing service of those gone to their reward, as well as the goodly fellowship into which you today come, are, at once, an incentive and an inspiration to you. You will now take the required obligation, and pronounce your inaugural address.

ARTICLE III.

SOME LITERARY APPROXIMATIONS.¹

BY ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER, LIT.D.

If we except constructive critics like Taine, literary criticism in the main bears a certain resemblance to Pennsylvania politics, in that it is often an effort to pull down from their pedestals one set of personages in order to make room for another set. It is the old struggle of those who are on the outside to force their way in—a struggle not confined to any one walk of life. In Porto Rico, under the Spanish regime, even the bones of the dead were cast from the hillside graves to make room for new occupants.

Within a year or two one of our modern destructive critics, unappreciative of richness, clearness and definiteness of thought, unexcelled power of observation, a condensation and swiftness of narrative that have seldom been equalled and mastery of the poetic art, has called Tennyson "a minor poet." Another writer has pronounced Longfellow "a dreaming German student." A recent article in a magazine given to the discussion of books, lately cast upon the scrap heap Thackeray's poem, "The Church Porch," and pronounced to be banal Tennyson's lines,

—"The little port
Had seldom seen a costlier funeral."

When Bernard Shaw in his play, "Caesar and Cleopatra," transports those personages to our time, instead of taking back his readers to their time, and Howells and Mark Twain uncork the vials of literary wrath upon Walter Scott's novels, we see the same instinct at work, the same aggressive assertion of the present at the ex-

1. Address at Commencement exercises of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, June 7, 1916, when the Degree of Doctor of Literature was conferred upon Mr. Pennypacker,

pense of the past. Thousands of years ago it was scornfully said:

"No doubt, but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you."

How soon the present glides into the past! Each generation in turn thinks lightly of the one preceding it. How will the next generation estimate the literature, the soft ideals, the practices of this? Will it look upon the legalized sale of war munitions by the people of a nation at peace to foreign nations at war, as we now look backward upon the once universally legalized human slavery?

That was wise advice, which recommended the daily hearing of some good music, the daily looking at a good picture, the daily reading of a good poem. Let us assume that it is too early in the morning for you to have read the poem, and let us consider for a few moments those familiar lines by Thackeray which "The Bookman" writer disposed of in so summary a fashion. Pendennis had gone up to London to open that tough oyster shell, which the world offers to most young men. At the university and in his love affairs, he had not so far covered himself with glory. There came to him an opportunity to earn some much needed money by doing a piece of literary hack work, the writing of some verses to accompany an engraving already provided for one of those old fashioned Annuals. So Pen shut himself in, and went to work with this result, for which the publisher was induced to pay a good round sum, not because he cared for the verses, but because he was persuaded that the author was a person of social importance:

AT THE CHURCH PORCH.

Although I enter not
Yet round about the spot
Ofttimes I hover;
And near the sacred gate,
With longing eyes I wait,
Expectant of her.

The Minster bell tolls out
Above the City's rout
And noise and humming:
They've hushed the Minster bell:
The organ 'gins to swell:
She's coming, she's coming!

My lady comes at last,
Timid, and stepping fast
And hastening hither,
With modest eyes downcast;
She comes—she's here—she's past!
May heaven go with her!

Kneel undisturbed, fair Saint!
Pour out your praise or plaint
Meekly and duly;
I will not enter there,
To sully your pure prayer
With thoughts unruly.

But suffer me to pace
Round the forbidden place,
Lingering a minute,
Like outcast spirits who wait
And see, through heaven's gate,
Angels within it.

The critic who found little or no merit in that poem was a woman. From this criticism, from the long list of delicate love songs in English poetry paying tribute to woman, from the comparatively few corresponding poems written by women and from the often expressed belief, shared by a number of men, that the feminine mind to a greater extent than the masculine mind, is direct and practical, and less given than the other to looking in diverse directions, the question arises whether this poem written by a man, and other similar poems from the time of Shakespeare, Waller, Herrick and Lovelace to the period of our own Pinkney and Aldrich, have their appeal

more to men than to women, in spite of the direction in which the compliment takes wing.

Customs and habits of thought have changed much since the poem by Pendennis was written to order as a pot boiler. At that time in America, the present day athletic sports, tennis, baseball, golf, polo, were unknown. Young men with that reverence for womankind, which, it is to be hoped, will never die out in wholesome young manhood, then waited at church doors on Sunday mornings throughout this land, just as the poem portrays the young man waiting at the English church porch. To-day there has been substituted the luncheon at the Bellevue-Stratford, the moving pictures, the Sunday golf and tennis. Everywhere an age of intenser work and of intenser pursuit of amusement has been substituted for the simpler ways. The change, however, need not blind us to the human nature manifested in other times, even though the manifestation of the same unchanging power of the lode-star be by different methods. We do not think of estimating George Washington by his unfamiliarity with steam or Abraham Lincoln by the circumstance that he never saw a trolley car or automobile or heard a telephone message. The impulse, taste, mind, whatever it may be called, bent exclusively on being up to date, which regards the past as something no longer to be considered, may easily fail in comprehension of Thackeray's poem. To the nature without capacity for reverence, it will have as little significance as it had to the destructive critic whose words have been quoted.

To pronounce the concluding lines of "Enoch Arden,"

—"The little port

Had seldom seen a costlier funeral."

a mere banality is to show a similar lack of mental expansiveness, because the judgment is the result of an appraisal of a past custom by the taste of the present. The best military critics have a sounder method. They do not study battles and campaigns in the light which history throws upon military movements. If Meade and Lee in July, 1863, had known all that is now known about the battle of Gettysburg, they would have known what

army commanders never know, not even in the day of aeroplanes and wireless messages. Military movements are therefore considered under such light as the army commander had at the time, or as a competent commander he should have had.

In one of Holland's great art galleries there is an impressive painting of the funeral of a Count of Flanders, which evinces to the spectator with indescribable power and solemnity the worldly place of him in whose honor occur these impressive ceremonies, this stately procession of imposing figures, these religious rites. The art of the Victorian poet is no more at fault than the art of the Dutch painter. Literary judgments, like most estimates of human work, are but approximations of the truth, and reflecting the likings of their period, are perpetually undergoing modification. Matthew Arnold's critical papers are replete with controversy—in large measure a modification of previous estimates. As all can raise the flower when all have got the seed, the unusual and new become the commonplace until disuse and forgetfulness again pave the way for rediscovery of the former freshness and attraction. Readers not much past middle life remember the Byron vogue, its decay and his reinstatement; the variations of the Wordsworthian barometer, the slow rise of Tennyson, whom Poe declared to be the greatest poet that ever lived, and the one time unquestioned position of our own Longfellow and Whittier, each working a theretofore undiscovered vein of pure ore. As there are lovers who are eager in pursuit until possession diminishes ardor, so does the world weary of the thought which has ceased to be unfamiliar. Even tales of the North Pole become Bromidean. The present day attitude of superiority towards the poetry of Tennyson and Longfellow is shared by a considerable number of persons who have not read their poems. One such critic, on being asked lately if he had read Longfellow's sonnets, admitted that he had not and subsequently expressed surprise at the rare quality of their artistry.

According to the epidemic of literary opinion which has prevailed now for a half score of years or more, it is un-

fortunate for a poet to possess thought and substance or to be clear and definite in expression. The era of the desultory mind in literature, as in painting and in politics, is too much with us. To be vague is to avoid attack by the submarines of the human mind, which, lying in wait in the deep waters of suspicion, prey upon the evidences of thrift, energy and thought, in either material or immaterial things. In the domain of modern literature it has been only the fruit rotten at the core that has been deemed worthy of marketing by the barrel, and if we may judge from the exclamations of approval, a sated mental palate has for some years taken to this diet with as keen a relish as the Eskimo takes to spoiled fish.

A recent History of American Literature Since 1870 by a Professor in a Pennsylvania College reflects throughout the present day exaggeration of the social sense at the expense of perspective and power and beauty, and that natural leadership which in spite of many experiments the world cannot do without.

It may serve to illustrate this thought by contrasting what Professor Pattee, an exponent of the exaggeration of the social sense, has to say of Thomas Buchanan Read, a Pennsylvania poet, and what certain famous Englishmen said of him. Inasmuch as large numbers of Americans accept placidly England's asserted authority and control over the oceans of the world, perhaps along with her dicta in matters of world-wide importance her judgment in the narrower field of American poetry may be acceptable. Of Bayard Taylor, George H. Boker and Thomas Buchanan Read, Professor Pattee declares, "it was theirs to strike the last notes, ineffective and all too often decadent, of that mid-century music that had begun with Bryant and Poe, with Emerson and Whittier, with Willis and Longfellow. They deliberately neglected the opportunity of reacting upon the actual, civic life of their own land within their own and later times."

Contemporary English judgments presented a radically different opinion. Thackeray said of Read's poem, "The Passing of the Iceberg," that he esteemed it as among the first of modern ballads. Walter Savage Landor wrote of

Read's "Midnight," "America steals a march on us." Dante Gabriel Rossetti sent to Philadelphia for all the lyrics written by Read that he could obtain. Leigh Hunt, who narrowly escaped being a Pennsylvania poet by his father's return from Philadelphia, where he had dwelt for a time, to his old home in England, published an article in the "North British Review," in which he declared Read's "The Closing Scene" to be unquestionably the best American poem he had met with, and with one or two exceptions the only American poem he could read over and over again. "It is," he wrote, "an addition to the permanent stock of poetry in the English language..... It merits the fame which Gray's 'Elegy' has obtained without deserving it nearly so well."

That master of words and their uses, Abraham Lincoln, whose tenacious memory held in store entire cantos from Byron's poems, carried Read's "The Oath" about with him, and asked James E. Murdock to read it a second time in the Senate chamber at Washington, making Hannibal Hamlin, Vice-President of the United States, bearer of the request. It may be doubted whether any similar use will be made of our modern poetry about "The Hired Man" from North of Boston, or whether Masefield's widows or heroes from the underworld will serve any similar nation-wide purpose or react to the same extent upon the civic life of their author's time. In fact the present "British Review" said a few months ago that dealing with sterner matters, English readers now demanded a more virile literature than the Arnold Bennetts and John Galsworthys could supply, and had rejected the modern product for the work of earlier authors, whom present day iconoclasts have been striving to displace. An article in the "English Poetry Review" for June of this year, says that "Prior to August, 1914, there was much applause for the sordid realism of Mr. Masefield's gloomier muse. To-day the impulse is toward a whiter flame, and we have passed from murkiness into light." Already, therefore, in Europe, that present, which Professor Pattee's History of modern American literature sets forth, has begun to glide into the past, taking with it

recent fancies, fashions, tastes and standards. On this side of the Atlantic a temporary and fading fashion still lingers, but we may be sure that at least the colonial mind of America will in due time change its preference and taste in literature, when it fully understands that the sanction to change has been given.

Let us turn for a few moments from the external estimates, already quoted in regard to Thomas Buchanan Read's work to the work itself. Instead of failing to reach the actual civic life of his own land in his own time, his American epic, "The New Pastoral," portrays the life of the miller, the wagoner, the mason, the boatman, the country folk of America and the migration to the West of a body of Pennsylvanians. The introduction is dated in the year 1854. Six years earlier Chicago had acquired its first ten miles of railroad. Four years earlier the town's population was less than 30,000. In 1854 no railroad across the continent had been built. The year of the poem was the year of Abraham Lincoln's first debate with Stephen A. Douglass, but the poet then living in Italy, probably had heard little of Lincoln. Read's prophecy, embraced in lines towards the conclusion of "The New Pastoral," a prophecy which fortells the rise of the great city on the lake, the coming of continental railroads and the work of Abraham Lincoln, appears one of the most extraordinary visions of the future occurring in any literature.

The poem opens happily:

Fair Pennsylvania!
 I have seen
In lands less free, less fair, but far more known,
The streams which flow through history, and wash
The legendary shores—and cleave in twain
Old capitals and towns, dividing oft
Great empires and estates of petty kings
And princes, whose domains full many a field,
Rustling with maize along our native West,
Out measures and might put to shame! and yet
Nor Rhine inebriate reeling through his hills,

Nor mighty Danube, marred with tyranny,
Its dull waves moaning on Hungarian shores—
Nor rapid Po, his opaque waters pouring
Athwart the fairest, fruitfulest and worst
Enslaved of European lands—nor Seine,
Winding uncertain through inconstant France—
Is half so fair as thy broad stream whose breast
Is gemmed with many isles, and whose proud name
Shall yet become among the names of rivers
A synonym of beauty—Susquehanna!

After many pages, when the pilgrims have reached the West, their long journey by wagon and boat, through forest and flood and over prairie completed, at last there comes the remarkable phophecy:

“Afar the woods before the vision fly—
Swift as a shadow o’er the meadow grass
Chased by the sunshine—and a realm of farms
O’er spreads the country wide; where many a spire
Springs in the valleys, and on distant hills,—
The watch towers of the land. Here quiet herds
Shall crop the ample pasture, and on slopes
Doze through the summer noon, while every beast
Which prowls, a terror to the frontier fold,
Shall only live in some remembered tale,
Told by Tradition in the lighted hall,
When the red grate usürps the wooded hearth,
Here shall the City spread its noisy streets,
And groaning steamers chafe along the wharves;
While hourly o’er the plain, with streaming plume,
Like a swift herald bringing news of peace,
The rattling train shall fly; and from the East—
E’en from the Atlantic to the new found shores
Where far Pacific rolls, in storm or rest,
Washing his sands of gold—the arrowy track
Shall stretch its iron bond through all the land,
Then these interior plains shall be as they
Which hear the ocean roar, and northern lakes
Shall bear their produce, and return them wealth;
And Mississippi, father of the floods,
Perform their errands to the Mexic gulf,

And send them back the tropic bales and fruits.
Then shall the generations musing here,
Dream of the troublous days before their time:
And antiquaries point the very spot
Where rose the first rude cabin and the space
Where stood the forest-chapel with its graves,
And where the earliest marriage rites were said,
Here in the middle of the nation's arms,
Perchance the mightiest inland mart shall spring;
Here the great statesman from the ranks of toil
May rise, with judgment clear, as strong as wise;
And with a well directed patriot blow,
Reclinch the rivets in our union bands,
Which tinkering knaves have striven to set ajar!"

These three Pennsylvania poets, Read, Taylor and Boker, lived in more stirring times than America has since known. They were all men of action as well as poets, in this respect differing from the best known of contemporary American authors,—Read a soldier; Taylor the representative of his country at St. Petersburg during the Civil War; Boker the President of the Philadelphia Union League, an active force in upholding the Union. Read's "Sheridan's Ride," and Boker's "The Black Regiment" and "Dirge for a Soldier," in energy, spirit or artistry, are unexcelled by any of our Civil War poetry. Taylor turned to the writing of novels, one of which, "The Story of Kennett," is a faithful picture of life in Southeastern Pennsylvania at the close of the eighteenth century, so simply told that the ingenuity of the plot is often overlooked. In most mystery novels the expert reader soon hits upon the secret. In "The Story of Kennett" the reader must perforce wait until the author chooses to make his disclosure.

Taylor's "Home Ballads" were published ten years after the Civil War. In them are drawn Pennsylvanian life and character with a faithfulness and understanding that could come only from life long familiarity. They do not depend for their effect upon peculiarities of dialect or custom, obvious to every eye or caught by the dullest ear, which lend themselves readily to the easiest recording by

the most callow of reporters. What has been called the near howling of the wolf of poverty, always in pursuit, hurries us on, but however hard we hold to a chosen course fate and fortune shape for us a different destiny. Such sincere life purposes, with their ambitions, disappointments and defeats, the contests between character and trial and the reaction of experience upon character are portrayed in Bayard Taylor's "Home Ballads," and no American poetry is more faithful to an author's surroundings and period. It has been a pleasure, it might be termed a duty, to call attention in this vicinity, consecrated by the life blood of his brother, here killed in battle at the head of his regiment, to the fact that Taylor, as well as Read and Boker, did not, as Professor Pattee asserts, neglect the opportunity of reacting upon the actual civic life of his life and time.

In literature there is needed not alone the social sense. The reaction from the overworking by novelists and poets of the exaltation of the submerged has already set in. Literature needs, besides the social sense, many qualities, among them perspective, restraint, form, the art which the practitioners of "free verse" have been trying with no great success to do without, the strength of substance, which is so markedly absent from many modern books, the filling of the well before it can slacken thirst, the inspiration and beauty, which makes Shakespeare, after three hundred years, a living force, or such poetry as Keats' sonnet, "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" and Poe's poem "To Helen," marvels in those surprises which genius has in store.

Finally in the present time of war-fare and thought of our own possible national peril by way of the Pacific or the Atlantic, how applicable is this apostrophe to our country, suggested to the poet Read by Power's Statue of America!

"O thou, my country, may the future see
Thy shape majestic stands supreme as now,
And every stain which mars thy starry robe
In the white sun of truth, be bleached away!

Hold thy grand posture with unswerving mien,
Firm as a statue proud of its bright form,
Whose purity would daunt the vandal hand
In fury raised to shatter! From thine eye
Let the clean light of freedom still dispread
The broad, unclouded, stationary noon!
Still with thy right hand on the fasces lean,
And with the other point the living source
Whence all thy glory comes; and where unseen,
But still all seeing, the great patriot souls,
Whose swords and wisdom left us thus enriched,
Look down and note how we fulfil our trust!
Still hold beneath thy fixed and sandal'd foot
The broken sceptre and the tyrants gyves:
And let thy stature shine above the world,
A form of terror and of loveliness!"

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

RADICAL CHANGE IN CARNEGIE PENSION PLAN
FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS.

BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM A. GRANVILLE, PH.D., LL.D.

Ten years ago the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching put into operation a system for pensioning college teachers at the age of sixty-five or over who had served from twenty-five to thirty years as professors or instructors. The pensions allowed averaged about 60 per cent. of the salaries received at the time of retirement and have been paid from the income from an endowment of several million dollars set aside for that purpose by Andrew Carnegie. Only teachers in colleges fulfilling certain conditions have as a rule been admitted to this privilege, one condition being that the college must satisfy certain specified requirements as to scholarship standards, endowment and material equipment. With this condition few have found fault except in so far as it may have tended to set up arbitrary and artificial educational standards. Another condition, however, operated to exclude teachers in denominational colleges from these pension benefits. This unwarranted and unjust discrimination against denominational colleges aroused a loud indignation chorus at the time. A committee consisting of the heads of some of the most prominent denominational colleges of the country entered a formal protest against this ruling, but to no avail. That the first colleges in this country were denominational, that these colleges set the high standard of American education and have maintained it, that they have furnished the Church with its ministry, that these colleges have educated the great majority of our past and present leaders in all lines of activity, that today the vast mass of college students and college teachers are to be found in such colleges, of all these facts no account was taken. Every college with the least trace of denominational control was absolutely shut out.

But it is a long lane that has no turn. In Bulletin IX just issued by the Carnegie Foundation we find outlined "A Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities for College Teachers" by Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Foundation. The statement is made that after ten years of experience the original pension plan has been weighed and found wanting, and now it is proposed to proceed along entirely new lines in the future. The chief weaknesses of the present system of pensions maintained by the Carnegie Foundation are given to be:

1. A teacher acquires protection for himself and family only after twenty-five or thirty years of service. It holds out to the man of thirty a hope of security which is very likely to be illusory.

2. No permanent advantage will accrue to any calling by lifting from the shoulders of its members a load which under moral or economic laws they ought to bear.

3. There will develop in the long run a tendency to use the pension as an offset to higher salaries, so that a free pension is likely to be paid for by him who receives it at a higher rate than it would cost if he bought the annuity.

4. The Foundation does not now give the teacher a contract binding it to give him a pension after a term of years. It has from the first specifically reserved the right to cease paying a pension at any time for any reason.

Thus the Foundation has in numerous cases cut off pensions and the adoption of the proposed new plan will result in the ultimate withdrawal of all the pensions now being paid.

5. It has been found a somewhat embarrassing use of trust funds for the Foundation to add say a \$2500 pension to a comfortable income already possessed by a retired teacher.

6. It has shown a tendency to restrict migrations of teachers from one college to another. It is in the interest of education that these migrations be free so that weak colleges may secure strong teachers.

President Pritchett has not, however, pointed out the greatest weakness in the existing pension system, which

is, that it excludes from its benefits without just cause the best and noblest and most deserving class of college teachers, namely the teachers laboring in denominational colleges. That such an inequitable pension plan should fail of best results was inevitable, it bore within itself the seeds of dissolution.

The new plan proposed by President Pritchett has not as yet been worked out in detail. Roughly it may be outlined as follows:

I. A sub-agency of the Foundation is to be incorporated according to the laws of the State of New York under the name of "The Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association," with a capital stock and surplus to be furnished and owned by the Foundation. It would offer only legitimate insurance including term insurance to end at age of sixty-five or later, ordinary life policies, and life policies paid up in twenty, twenty-five or thirty years. It will offer annuities for sale *one-half of the cost to be paid by the teacher and one-half by the college*. This dividing of the cost of an annuity (pension) between the teacher and the college is the "kernel in the nut" of the new plan.

II. A second sub-agency of the Foundation is to be organized under the name "The Teachers' Saving Association." The sole function of this agency would be to receive the payments from teachers and colleges, to invest them in sound securities and to guarantee a certain fixed rate of interest on same. Upon the retirement of the teacher, the accumulated capital would be paid to the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association for the purchase of an annuity. In case of death before sixty-five, the accumulated capital would either be returned to the widow or invested in an annuity for her. In case of retirement from the teachers' calling the accumulated capital would be returned with interest at an agreed rate.

That the above plan, backed by the Foundation's millions, will be safe, is obvious, and that the cost to teacher and college will be relatively low is evident from the fact that the Foundation will (a) pay the cost of administration, including the two sub-agencies. (b) It will undertake to carry the cost of invalidity (disability) pension in

the case of all teachers having insurance and annuity contracts. (c) It will be called on to pay part of the cost of pensions to widows. (d) It will pay taxes on insurance premiums and guarantee a good rate of interest on all accumulations.

The new plan contemplates the covering of the two main risks which confront the man entering the career of a teacher and affecting the welfare of himself and those dependent on him,—first, the risk of premature death during productive life; second, the risk of dependence when his income-earning power declines. The first can be met only by some form of insurance, the second by some form of annuity. The solution here presented consists of a combination of insurance at cost with an annuity available at a definite age.

While President Pritchett does not specifically state that teachers in denominational colleges will be admitted to the privileges of the new plan, and it is easy to understand why he does not make such a statement, he repeatedly points out as one of the strongest arguments in favor of the new plan that its benefits will be available to the great majority of college teachers instead of to only a relatively few as under the present system.

As the present pension system of the Carnegie Foundation offers nothing to denominational colleges it is clear that from their standpoint the new plan is much to be preferred. As far as our Lutheran institutions are concerned someone may say that because they have as a rule no available funds from which the college half of the cost of the annuity would be paid, the new plan would become for them practically inoperative. While that may be true as to present conditions it certainly will not hold for the future. Just as now our Lutheran colleges are gradually raising their standards of scholarship and equipment in order to successfully compete with first grade colleges so the time will surely come when it will be necessary for them to provide pensions for their teachers if they shall be able to secure the best men in the teaching profession. When that time comes the proposed new pension plan of the Carnegie Foundation will

be found to be a God-send, they will then be able to secure pensions for their teachers for less than half of what they would now cost.

Not the least of the advantages of the new plan will be that we shall in the future be spared the humiliating experience of witnessing an unseemly scramble by some denominational colleges to disown the churches by whom they were conceived, born and nourished, in order that their teachers may benefit by the present pension system.

Many such colleges have already had occasion to rue the day when they bartered their denominational heritage for a mess of pension pottage. Happily none of our Lutheran colleges have thus gone astray, and the adoption of this new Carnegie pension plan for college teachers will definitely remove the temptation to do so in the future.

*Pennsylvania College,
Gettysburg, Pa.*

ARTICLE V.

"THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF TODAY."

BY PROFESSOR HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D.

Books on the Old Testament continue to multiply. In recent years we have had the long (and as yet incomplete) series of Prof. Charles Foster Kent, the books of Dr. Henry Preserved Smith in the *International Series* (Old Testament History, and The Religion of Israel), Peritz's *Old Testament History*, Peters' *Religion of the Hebrews*, the books of Prof. Eislén (particularly *The Christian View of the Old Testament*, and his *Biblical Introduction Series*—the first volume of which, on the Pentateuch, has just appeared), and a great number of others, like Bade's *Old Testament in the Light of Today*, dealing with the questions of the Old Testament less formally. Our review is limited to American books, and more particularly to the last-named volume. Prof. Bade's book has been widely advertized as presenting, in popular form, the findings of "modern scholarship" with respect to the Old Testament. It was written, the author tells us, before H. P. Smith's *Religion of Israel* and J. P. Peters' *Religion of the Hebrews* appeared, but it belongs to the same school. All of these books are miscalled; what we have in them is, The Old Testament in the Light of the Wellhausen Hypothesis, The Religion of Israel on the Basis of the Wellhausen Hypothesis, etc. While this hypothesis has had wide acceptance, it is not so wide as to make it synonymous with "Today."

It is true, as the author says, that two views of the Old Testament still contend for the mastery; but the line of division is not where he places it. He thus describes the two positions: "One regards the Old Testament as a sort of talisman, miraculously given and divinely authoritative on the subject of God, religion, and morals, in every part. The other regards it as a growth, in which the

moral sanctions of each stage of development were succeeded and displaced by the next higher one." The traditional position is set forth in two citations. A statement is quoted from J. H. Brookes' *Anti-Higher Criticism*: "The Bible itself knows of but one kind of inspiration, and that is an inspiration which extends to every chapter, verse, word, and syllable of the original Scriptures, using the mind and mouth, the heart and hand of the writers, guiding them in the least particular against blunder, and making their utterance the very Word of God to our souls..... The Scripture, and the entire Scripture, claims to be, and is in fact, altogether exempt from errors or mistakes of any sort." The second citation is from the prospectus of a California Bible Institute: "The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are without error or misstatement in their moral and spiritual teachings and record of historical facts. They are without error or defect of any kind." Against such a position the author revolts.

It is a question whether the Christian believer of the present day must be asked to limit himself to the view expressed in these citations. The extension of our knowledge in fields covered by the Old Testament has made the simple faith of such statements difficult for us. In relation to the Bible there are three main sources of knowledge from which we have derived ideas which call for interpretation—Archaeology, Comparative Religion, and Historical Criticism.

Archaeology has forced us to rewrite the early history of civilized man. It has pushed back millenniums the beginnings of human history. Time was when the Bible reader thought that the oldest records of the human race lay before him. "The giant figures of the patriarchs towered aloft in lonely grandeur. In their simple nomad life men saw the first beginnings of civilization." Archaeology has rewritten the book of human beginnings. "For many years it has been known that Egypt flourished centuries prior to Abraham; that it had an amazingly high civilization, which was old in his day; and that its political institutions were already greatly advanced.....

Babylonian archaeology has corroborated this... Thousands of inscriptions have been brought to light, by the help of which a knowledge of the life and customs of the people prior to Abraham's day is unfolded before our eyes, changing our entire conception of those distant times, and revealing a civilization which had advanced in an astonishing degree centuries before the patriarch. Instead of possessing only the names of a score or more individuals between Adam and Abram, as found in Genesis, many thousands became known. In a single document (the Obelisk of Manishtusu), for instance, written two thousand years before the patriarch, about five hundred names are given. And yet the great work of excavating the cities of ancient Babylonia is only in its infancy."¹ Abraham, we have come to see, stands only midway between the first civilization that we know and the coming of Christ. "The code of a great lawgiver, living as far behind the time of Moses as the age of Alfred the Great is behind us, speaks of the complex laws of property and public and private duty that are the surest signs of a long-established state." Moreover, parallels to the early stories of the Old Testament—the Creation and the Deluge—have been found on tablets of baked clay and cylinders, recensions one of another. Is it possible that no adjustment of our views is necessary in the light of these facts?

A similar question arises when we survey the widening fields of knowledge opened to us by Comparative Religion. From one point of view the results of this study have been pure gain. It has been most heartening, in this materialistic age, to have had borne in upon us with such overwhelming evidence that religion is a universal fact. It has been our stay and support. The comment of the editor of *Die Religio-geschichtliche Volksbücher*, a series of wide circulation in Germany which has for its object the dissemination of advanced liberalism, is of peculiar significance at this time. He says: "Today among the German people estrangement from religion is

¹ Clay, "Light on the Old Testament from Babel."

no longer received as 'progress.' Religion is again a vital problem for the people and its leaders." A similar conclusion is to be drawn from the many works which examine the phenomena of religion from the standpoint of psychology, demonstrating the universality of the facts of religious experience. Modern missionary enterprise has been greatly enlarged in its scope by the recognition of this fact. But while this is true—and the gain is keenly felt in the missionary field—it is also true that the Christian apologist who seeks to define the relation of his religion to the other religions of the world, has a new and complex task before him. Can we still hold that Christianity is the absolute religion and that the Bible gives us an exclusive revelation of God? Are there no other lines of convergence in Jesus Christ save those which run through the Old Testament? It is evident that we must be prepared to defend our faith in a new court.

Again, Christian faith has to define its attitude to the results of Higher Criticism as applied to the books of the Bible. I am speaking of the Old Testament here. Probably nine-tenths of Old Testament scholars accept some form of the Critical theory, involving, in its broadest outlines, the Source theory of the composition of the Pentateuch, progressive legislation, the gradual development of a central sanctuary, and the post-exilic origin of the Priest code. What effect does this theory have upon Christian faith? There are not a few devout scholars who believe that the reconstruction of the Old Testament on the basis of Criticism is an immense gain for Christian faith. It has brought home, they say, the presence of God in the life of the people. Instead of all the laws of a nation's religious life being given through one man, they were accumulated through centuries of time. Step by step God walked with His people. The supply of interpreters of the divine has never failed. In a natural evolution the religious life of Israel but matched the divine disclosure in the climax of the Priest code. So argued such scholars as Robertson Smith, the Davidsons, Driver and Skinner in Great Britain, and Briggs, Brown, Toy and Moore in America. We must respect the convictions

of such men. But it is clear again that the theory carries with it some heavy liabilities. E. g., to learn what seems to be the historical sequence of the institutions of Israel and to trace the analogies between them and those of other nations, is illuminating and valuable; but we must not assume that when that is done the work of explaining the origin of its ideas is done. The average intelligent Bible student is probably willing to suspend judgment as to the manner of the composition of the Pentateuch, for example. Luther once said, "What matters it if Moses should not have written the Pentateuch?" The great divide comes, not between theories of composition but between theories of interpretation. How are we to read the Old Testament as it stands? In reviewing Wellhausen's *History of Israel and Judah* (7th ed.), Prof. Wilke recently observed, "Geschichte lässt sich eben nur auf Grund ganz bestimmter Voraussetzungen schreiben"—which recalls the words of Princ. Fairbairn, "In Germany every speculation has its corresponding theological tendency." In 1834 Ed. Reuss was lecturing on Old Testament Theology at Strasburg, and by the development theory he found it psychologically impossible that a nation should begin its history with a fully developed code of laws. But how was he to explain the case of Israel? Criticism did not help him. At that time the results of Criticism were "assured"; and they were to the effect that a single ancient work (E) was taken up by a later writer (J) as the basis of a new and enlarged edition. This original record (Grundschrift) was amplified by degrees, by supplementing E with J, and this in turn with D and this combination in turn by E². "D" was put in the time of Manasseh. So far, with the exception of DeWette and Eichhorn, the Critics had aimed at reconciling the critical analysis with the historical trustworthiness of the dissected records. In other words, they were taking the sources at face value. Reuss said that it came to him as an intuition that the Prophets were earlier than the Law, and the Psalms later than both. In 1835, the year which

2 Cf. I Sam. 28:24; Gen. 27:9-14; Gen. 43:16; Judges 6:19.

saw the publication of the first edition of Bauer's *Leben Jesu*—the year following Reuss' intuition—Wm. Vatke published his *Biblische Theologie*, in which, avowedly from the Hegelian standpoint, he reached the same conclusion as Reuss, i. e., that Prophetism antedated Mosaism, which must now be put late. This theory was brilliantly developed and popularized by K. H. Graf of Leipzig, a pupil of Reuss', and today the theory is very commonly known as the Grafian hypothesis. The post-exilic date of P now became the important question of Criticism, and it was while the discussion on this point was engaging the attention of Old Testament scholars that Wellhausen's *History of Israel* appeared (1878). Kuenen styled this work "the crowning fight of the long campaign of Criticism." Cornill says that since its appearance the whole science of Old Testament criticism has ranged itself around the question, for or against Wellhausen. Taking his cue from Vatke, whom he acknowledged as his master in Criticism, Wellhausen rang the changes on the famous Four Points of his theory:

(1). A central place of worship does not appear until Deuteronomy, which is not earlier than the 18th year of Josiah.

(2). Sacrifice was not originally localized but occurred in every slaughter and every meal. Only after Ezekiel is it limited to a central place and to the hands of the priests.

(3). The sacred calendar had a similar development from only the Spring festival at the time of sheep-shearing to three in JE and D, and five in P.

(4). Originally there was no distinction between Priests and Levites (cf. Deut.), that distinction coming in only with Ezekiel and the P code, when the sons of Zadok were reduced to hierodulic service.

Wellhausen's name is famous because with consummate literary skill he drew the picture of Israel which his premises required. Israel was but a desert tribe, like other Semites, and Israel's religion had a correspondingly low origin. The Patriarchs were adherents of animism and fetishism. In the beginning there was no real monothe-

ism or moral idea of God. The God of Israel came to be distinctly recognized after the occupation of the land of Canaan, in the conflict with the Canaanite gods. It was not until the eighth century B. C. that ethical monotheism, the religion of Israel, was created by the Prophets. In the legislation of the Priests, which followed the age of prophecy, this faith became stereotyped and authoritative. With a bold hand Wellhausen drew the conclusions of the radical critical hypothesis, and we may date from the appearance of his work the distinction between radical and conservative criticism. The Wellhausen school assumed an air of confidence, and it is not to be denied that its hypothesis has been accepted by a large number of Old Testament scholars. Two years ago Wellhausen's seventieth birthday was celebrated with a memorial volume, as is customary in Germany; and in the preface Wellhausen is crowned by Prof. Marti, of the University of Berne, as the Master. How completely he is the master these books which we have been considering show. Marti has written a *Religion of the Old Testament; its Place among the Religions of the Nearer East*, in which the author discards altogether the traditional view as to the residence of the early ancestors of the people in Mesopotamia, and begins with a picture of a number of bedawin tribes living in North Arabia and in the regions south of Palestine. It is, in fact, a rewriting of Wellhausen's *Das Heidenthum*. The religion of these people may be best described as polydaemonism, i. e., belief in a multitude of spiritual powers manifesting themselves in stones and trees, in springs and animals. Mount Sinai was the rendezvous of different Semitic tribes which sojourned in the regions round about. The God of this mountain was called Jahweh, and was conceived as the God of the higher sphere, as the God of the air and storms, in distinction from the powers of the earth. Moses, living among these people in banishment, had an intuition that this God was the God to deliver Israel, etc. Similarly Peritz in his *Old Testament History* (p.87) :

"The Biblical tradition clearly makes Moses Israel's discoverer of Jehovah and the medium by whom Jehovah

becomes the God of Israel. What the religious conceptions of the tribes were prior to Moses is no longer clearly discernable, for the superior force of the Jehovah religion drove the others from the field. Arguing from analogy of the growth of religions in general and the primitive stages of other Semitic religions, it has been concluded that the religion of Jehovah was preceded among the Hebrews by the various stages of animism and fetishism, and ancestor worship; but these manifestations lie far back of the historical period."

This is Wellhausenism and one of the "assured results" of radical Criticism. It is the basis of the book before us, the gist of "*The Old Testament in the Light of Today.*" This is the way in which this school of Critics, whose souls are straightened for the truth, handle the sources of the religion they are studying. Bade says he feels called of God to start with facts and not with dogma. "Where the traditionalist," says Bade, "sees one unbroken plain of heaven-descended perfect morality, the thoughtful man of today finds 'a land of hills and valleys,' as the Deuteronomist said of Palestine." That is good rhetoric, but it were nearer the truth to say that the school of thinkers to which the author belongs sees in the Old Testament an unbroken plain of earth-evolved morality, as over against what he calls the "traditional" view that revelation is a land of hills and valleys, and that on these hill-tops we have something which is not accounted for by tribal customs, tribal laws or a series of myths and legends.

This book is but an echo of Robertson Smith's "*The Religion of the Semites*," which in turn is an echo of Wellhausen. "*The Religion of the Semites*" is a rich mine of information concerning ancient Semitic practices as drawn from Arabic sources—the nature of the religious community, the relation of gods to their worshippers, holy places, sacrifice and the sacrificial ritual. It is of great value to the discriminating Bible student. But it is to be remembered that Robertson Smith saw no higher origin of sacrifice than the table-bond theory, after the analogy of bedawin compacts, in which the god and the

worshipper are knit together by bonds created by the interchange of hospitality. It rests upon the totemistic idea of reverencing an animal which is believed to share with men the divine nature. But, as has long since been pointed out, there is no evidence that totemism prevailed among the Semites, or that there was a relation between the common meal and sacrifice. "Originally all slaughter was sacrifice," says Robertson Smith, and this is an essential premise in his argument; but this is by no means borne out by the records.² Wellhausen admits that slaying and sacrifice are not coincident in the P code. Therefore, if the Critical theory should be found to be in error, the theory of the origin of sacrifice as a sacramental, table-bond rite falls. Moreover, as A. B. Davidson has pointed out, the theory fails to account for the burnt-offering, which was one of the earliest, most solemn, and, at times, the most important of all sacrifices.

Why should it be unscientific—i. e., a presumption of too advanced a stage of religious development—to say that sacrifice originated in the religious instinct? We find that instinct present very early among the Babylonians (IV R. 20, obr. 22ff.), "As the earth brings her tribute to her overlord, so the offerer brought his tribute." The divinity is represented as tasting the meat-offerings (Deluge text). Near the sacrificer stands the prayer-maker; the sacrifice is to incline the deity to the worshipper. The thought of atonement is not absent, for the term *Kuppuru* occurs. From this land between the Tigris and the Euphrates come our earliest records of the human race. It is a voluminous literature, rich in devotional writings. The constant note is penitence. So like the Psalms of Israel are the Babylonian penitential psalms that some scholars have said that the former have been taken from the latter. A cursory reading of these hymns and prayers (cf. Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*) is sufficient to show that there is a closer relation with the genius of the Hebrew religion of the Old Testament sources than in the Hebrew religion of Wellhausen's and Smith's reconstruction. What is

lacking is the true God, not the human need, which is the mother of sacrifice.

How do the natural religionists explain sin? From the taboo. "A taboo may roughly be described as something that one must not do lest ill befall." After touching a corpse, or the blood of a sacrifice, or handling objects connected with the sanctuary, certain cautions were to be observed. "Holiness" and "uncleanness" were believed to be catching like a contagious disease, and the unpleasant consequences of the violation of a taboo might be communicated to a whole community. Thus the penalties for sin in the Old Testament are explained. Sin, in the sense in which the Prophets understood it, is an unknown idea among the early Israelites.³ The words "holy" and "unclean" have nothing to do with moral distinctions. Adam's sin was the violation of a food taboo; Achan's, the violation of devoted possessions. Bade makes St. Paul's doctrine of total depravity but the carrying over from the Old Testament of the idea of infection from a violated taboo. But this non-moral explanation of sin utterly fails to do justice to the sources. It is too late in the history of Bible interpretation to rob Gen. iii of its profoundly moral tone. As the distinguishing characteristic of the Hebrew conception of God lies in His ethical personality, so the distinguishing mark of man is his likeness to God. As Gordon has said, "we have here an ideal portrait of man as a moral personality, who can fulfil his true vocation only in home and social life through the various obligations and responsibilities of marriage, friendship, and work, but above all as a religious being, who reaches his highest life in fellowship with God, 'walking with Him,' doing His will, and thus growing 'like Him' in character. This representation of man's nature and destiny stands as far above the parallel myths of other nations as the Old Testament conception of God, even in its earlier stages, above theirs."⁴ And

3 "Good and evil, as spoken of in Gen. ii, iii, point to no contrast of some actions with others according to their moral distinctions..... They mean primarily nothing more than salutary and hurtful." Wellhausen. Prol. p. 301. Eng. tran.

4 The Early Traditions of Genesis, p. 153.

Budde, speaking of Gen. iii, says: "It wants nothing but the word sin. But though the word is absent, sin itself is there, and comes clearly to light before the mind of every reader. Indeed, attention has often been justly drawn to the fact that all the mental steps in the development of sin, up to the actual deed and its consequences, with all their shameful, degrading, miserable, and humiliating effects, have been traced and described, in a few words, with a mastery perhaps never approached. There is no need, then, for the author to give his readers a definite headline. If he were to ask them what spiritual power it was that had passed before their eyes, I at least would consider but one answer possible: viz., 'sin.'" (Bibl. Urgesch. pp. 70 f.) With this view of man Babylonian literature measurably agrees. With all its confusing polytheism and its low conception of deity (its gods are like titan men, moved by savage passions, striving by the pettiest tricks to upset each other's plans), it yet reflects a consciousness of sin which is not a matter of merely ceremonial commission or omission—the violation of some taboo of a god. While this idea is frequently expressed—it were strange if it were not—"it would be a great error to imagine," says Jeremias, "that the Babylonians did not include moral faults and feelings in their idea of sin."⁵ Faults which we recognize as vio-

⁵ The tables of exorcisms of the Shurpu series are evidences of this:

Has he caused division between father and son,
Has he caused division between mother and daughter

.....?
Has he trespassed in his neighbor's house, approached his neighbor's wife, shed his neighbor's blood, stolen his neighbor's garment?

.....
Has he been upright in speech, false in heart?

With his mouth full of yea, his heart full of nay?

Is it upon injustice that he has thought, to drive away the righteous, to destroy, to sin, to occupy himself with evil

Has he promised with his heart and mouth, but not kept it, by a (retained) gift despised the name of his God, consecrated something, but held it back?

And from the famous Zimmern text (IV. R. 60):

I, myself, however, thought only of prayer and supplication, prayer was my rule, sacrifice my habit. The day of the god's wor-

lations of the Decalogue are confessed, while the conception of the Deluge as a punishment falling upon the sins of mankind and the myths of punitive visitations before the Flood seem to indicate primeval sin.

Similarly Bade looks upon the Decalogue in its Old Testament setting as an anachronism. The reason is, "the lawmaker does not precede, but follows the developing social conscience. What the lawgiver enacts into formal precept or law must previously have proved its worth in the collective experience..... It is a mistake to think that a Hebrew lawgiver could make eight o'clock into noon by pushing the hands of the clock around..... Belief in the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue in any of the forms in which it has come down to us may be regarded as abandoned by Most Old Testament scholars." Here follows a list of Wellhausen sympathisers. But again we may quote Critics of unquestioned scholarship against Bade. Prof. Kittel said several years ago: "Of late years, principally under the influence of Wellhausen—the idea was first mooted by Goethe, who perhaps did not mean it to be seriously adopted—the attempt has been made to maintain as a dogma of Old Testament criticism that the real and original Decalogue is not found in Exodus xx:1-17, but in Ex. xxxiv:11-26.....Ex.xxxiv:11-26 has never been a Decalogue, nor does it claim to be such. It is only a careless, and perhaps not serious, recension of v. 28 which led Goethe to take this position..... The passage cannot be reduced to ten precepts without omitting parts of the text. It is quite certain that the passage is nothing other than a parallel to the Book of the Cove-

ship was the joy of my heart, the day of the following of the goddess was to me profit and riches.

To do homage to the king, that was my joy; also to play to him, that was pleasant unto me. I taught my land to respect the name of God; to honor the name of the goddess, I instructed my people.....

If I but knew that before God such was well-pleasing.

But what seems good to oneself, that is bad with God; what is despicable to anyone's mind that is good to his God. Who has understood the counsel of the gods in heaven; the plan of a god full of darkness, who has fathomed it. How could be understood the way of my dim-sighted men! Cf. Jeremias: "Light from the Ancient Orient," I p. 225 ff.

nant..... There is no reason why these (the ten commandments of Ex. xx) should not be ascribed to Moses... In favor of the existence of a collection of such short fundamental laws in early Israel is the fact that the ancient Egyptians also had such a collection in their Book of the Dead." And König has argued with great patience that the great merit of Moses lies in the fact of his connection of the religious idea with the moral life. Similarly Jastrow says: "The Decalogue, which in its original form bears the stamp of Moses' personality, contains the germ of the teaching of the Prophets that Jahweh is a God of justice and mercy who demands as a condition of blessing obedience to laws which have a distinct ethical tone."

It all comes back to this question—and this is the real point of departure between the positive and the negative schools of Criticism—at what point in the history of Israel did the great awakening to ethical monotheism, which constituted Israel the peculiar people of God, enter? Did it come, as the Wellhausen school says, with the great prophets of the 8th century B. C., or did it come, as the sources say, with Moses? When it is said that the prophets of the 8th century B. C. were the creators of Israel's religion, it is an accommodation to a presupposition and not a setting forth of the facts as they lie in the sources. It has again and again been pointed out⁶ that the prophets of the 8th century B. C. were, according to their own testimony, primarily only reformers. They had the mission of bidding their contemporaries turn back to the religion as founded in Israel's youth (Hos. 11:1) and of protesting against all the moral and religious deviations by which smaller and larger circles in Israel had denied that religion. The prophets imply a

⁶ In König's "Die Hauptprobleme," and "Die Geschichte der alttest. Religion"; in James Robertson's "The Early Religion of Israel"; in Kittel's "Die Geschichte der Hebräer"; in Oettli's "Der Kultus bei Amos u. Hosea"; in Sellin's "Beiträge zur isr. u. jud. Religionsgeschichte"; in Giesebrecht's "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes"; in Volz's "Mose"; in von Orelli's article on "The Religion of Israel" in the *Int. Bib. Enc.*, etc.

background. They hold Israel to a standard, and that standard was "the law as given by Moses."

What scientific objection is there to the Biblical theory of Israel's religion? Archaeology has pushed back the beginnings of human history and shown that a high degree of civilization and literary activity flourished prior to the date even of the Patriarchs. Why should not this fact be welcomed? What is the determining principle of the Wellhausen reconstruction of Old Testament history? Wm. Vatke, from whom Wellhausen admitted that he had "learned the most and the best," has frankly given the reason. It is the Hegelian principle of development. He says: "The historical course of the religion of the Old Testament comes to light as the outcome of the whole movement. If the tradition of the Hebrews gave the real course of the history of this people and its religion, we should find ourselves face to face with an enigma to which we can find absolutely no analogy; we should have the culmination at the beginning." But is it a fact that the "culmination" is "at the beginning?" The historical tradition in the Old Testament runs in the path of a steady development. There is a development in the religious conceptions of Israel—in regard to the names of God and His attributes, and in the matter of legislation and prophecies. But this development, so far as the sources disclose the facts to us, does not begin with totemism and animism, but, at the worst, only with "strange gods" (Josh. 24:2, 15). The Patriarchs knew God and had communion with Him; they heard His voice, and they knew who spake to them. "The prophetic factor, which goes through the entire history of Israel and constitutes the life-principle that fills its religion and causes its further development, is at the very first beginnings the source whence the knowledge of God is taken." (Orelli). This presupposes from the beginning a personal God, who stands over against Israel at every stage of the nation's religious history. The manifestations of this God differ with the successive stages of Israel's expanding intelligence, advancing from the family covenant with Abraham to the national covenant under Moses, and from this,

when the nation broke down, to the covenant of Jeremiah and the Prophets, but it is the same God who appears in the sources from Genesis to the end.

But should the sources show "the culmination at the beginning," why should not the historian acknowledge it? It is scientific to find history in its sources, not to evolve it out of a philosophical theory. "The self-consciousness of Israel," says A. B. Davidson, "is a phenomenon almost more singular than the religion itself." The records of Israel are so remarkable because the nation had such a remarkable consciousness of its mission. A nation records its history only when it becomes conscious that it has a history to record, and what it records bears the antecedent probability in its favor as to the order and importance of its epochs. It is just possible that Hegelian evolution does not explain Israel's religious history and that the Old Testament in the light of today will turn out to be the Old Testament in the light of the Bible.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VI.

THE RELATION OF FAITH AND WORKS.

BY REV. G. ALBERT GETTY.

By many it has been thought that there is a radical difference, if indeed not an absolute contradiction, between the teachings of Paul and those of James on the subject of justification, and at first sight it might appear that such was the case. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, says, "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight," (3:20) and again, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (3:28). St. James, on the other hand, declares, "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone," (2:17) and a little further on in the same chapter says, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (2:24).

As a matter of fact, however, there is no real conflict between the teachings of these two inspired writers. Each views the truth from his own standpoint. Each one is seeking to emphasize the aspect of truth which appears to be of most vital concern to those to whom he is writing, and, as is so often the case, the whole truth is to be found by placing their teachings side by side, and blending them one into the other.

It is not to be denied that this apparent conflict in the truths presented by Paul and James has often been the occasion of much honest perplexity on the part of sincere and earnest Christians. It must likewise be admitted that differing apprehensions of the vital truth upon this all-important subject have been the cause of much bitter theological controversy. The Romish system is founded upon the idea of "work-righteousness," that is, that a man's good deeds may be made to contribute to his salvation, or to put it in the language of James, "By works a man is justified, and not by faith only." In the practical working out of this system, great stress is laid upon

the value of external acts of self-denial, penance, and the like. Protestantism came into being from the re-affirmation of the cardinal truth of the New Testament, that a man is saved by faith in Jesus Christ, and by nothing else. It holds fast to the gospel message enunciated in John 3:16: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son *that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have eternal life.*" Over against the "work-righteousness" of Rome, Luther and his co-laborers planted themselves upon the position of Paul, and used as their battle cry the oft-repeated words of sacred Scripture, "*The just shall live by faith.*"

It is to be remarked, however, that in the rebound from the extreme position of the Roman Catholic Church, the pendulum did not swing to the other extreme of its arc. The conservatism which marked the great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, is one of the strongest proofs of the fact that it was the work of the Spirit of God, rather than the work of men.

Martin Luther himself, in the earlier years of his life, sought peace for his troubled soul, in the faithful performance of all the external acts required of him by the Church of Rome. He even entered into an Augustinian monastery and there performed the most menial tasks in the hope that he might thus obtain assurance of divine pardon and eternal salvation for his soul. But these things failed to bring comfort to his troubled heart, and his mental and spiritual struggles grew more intense with the passing of the months. Then he found a copy of the sacred Scriptures and applied himself to a diligent study of this wonderful book. Here he found the precious doctrine of salvation by grace, of the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and upon his consciousness dawned the glorious truth that a sinner is justified in the sight of God *by faith* in Jesus Christ. This message from the divine word brought comfort to his soul; he turned to Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world and at His feet found the promised rest; he cast his burden of guilt upon the Lamb of God who was sacrificed upon Calvary, and his heart was filled with peace and joy. From this time on, it be-

came the one great object of his life to make this life-giving truth known unto others, to share with them the great blessings which had come into his own inner experience. "Justification by faith" became the one great theme of his teaching and preaching. In defense of this truth he was willing to give his testimony before kings and cardinals, scholars and knights. Around this truth he grouped all other teachings of the word, so that his system of doctrine as it gradually developed became *Christo-centric*, that is to say, *Christ* was the pivotal center around which everything else revolved.

But there were those who when they received this doctrine of Luther's, turned their backs upon the commandments and precepts of the divine word and sought to cast contempt upon all efforts to live a righteous life. So far indeed did some of these misguided people go in their utter disregard for the law of God that grave scandals broke out, and in 1537, one who at an earlier date had been closely associated with Luther, wrote, "All who follow Moses must go to the devil; to the gallows with Moses." Such utterances filled the heart of Luther and colleagues with sorrow and concern. For not only did it react against the cause of evangelical reform, but it brought into reproach the glorious gospel of the Lord Jesus, and led men from truth into error, from salvation to perdition. Against all such pernicious distortions of the truth the Reformers raised their voice and pen, and in the midst of the troubled waters, sought to steer with a firm hand between the rocks on either hand.

In the matchless Confession of Faith presented by the Reformers at Augsburg on June 25th, 1530, the subject is fully treated, and if to-day there are those who have any difficulty in understanding the relation between faith and works, and the part which each plays in salvation, the careful reading of the Sixth Article of the Augsburg Confession, which treats of the subject of the New Obedience ought to make the matter clear. The Sixth Article of the Confession reads thus:

"They [our churches], likewise teach, that this faith must bring forth good fruits; and that it is our duty

to perform those good works which God has commanded, because it is his will, and not in expectation of thereby meriting justification before him. For, remission of sins and justification are secured by faith; as the declaration of Christ testifies: "When ye shall have done all those things say, we are unprofitable servants." The same thing is taught by the ancient ecclesiastical writers, for Ambrose says, "This has been ordained by God, that he who believes in Christ shall be saved without works, receiving a remission of sins gratuitously through faith alone."

In considering more particularly the teaching of this Article of the Confession, let me first of all direct your attention briefly to the subject of Justification by Faith. One of the most difficult things that the average man has to do is to recognize clearly his own utter inability to save himself or even to contribute towards his own justification in the sight of God. An eminent preacher of a by-gone generation said in one of his sermons, "Whoever is acquainted with the nature of mankind in general or the propensity of his own heart in particular, must acknowledge that self-righteousness is the last idol that is rooted out of the heart." (Whitefield). This is only too true. It is natural for a man to seek to justify himself; it is difficult for him to realize that his righteousness is but as filthy rags in the sight of that pure and holy God with whom we have to do, and to cast himself entirely upon the free grace of God as manifested to the world in Jesus Christ. We sing, but too often without realizing the solemn import of the words:

"Just as I am, without one plea
But that thy blood was shed for me
And that thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come."

Yet in that hymn is voiced the teaching of sacred Scripture. So also in that other hymn so dear to the heart of the believer:

“Nothing in my hand I bring
Simply to thy cross I cling
Naked, come to Thee for dress,
Helpless, look to Thee for grace,
Foul, I to the fountain fly,
Wash me, Saviour, *or I die.*”

It is the clear teaching of the divine word that no man can save himself. We are all of us sinners, and are justified freely, gratuitously, through the mercy and the grace of God. Paul argues the entire subject at length in the Epistle to the Romans and concludes his argument in the oft-quoted words: “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.” (Rom. 3:28). Luther wrote: “*No one but Jesus Christ has died for our sins; but if He be the only one who takes away our sins, we cannot do this by our works.*” Justification by faith is the central teaching of the New Testament, upon which must rest our hope of justification and salvation, and there is no doctrine so full of comfort to anxious and troubled souls as this.

But now the question arises as to good works. What are good works? Why are they necessary? In what spirit and with what motive are they to be performed?

To all these questions the sixth article of the Confession gives clear and definite answers. It draws a clear distinction between all merely external or legalistic observances imposed by human tradition or decree and those practical Christian duties which God has commanded in His Word. In the view of the reformers “good works” do not consist in the observance of those requirements which the Church of Rome seeks to lay upon the consciences of her people and which may be performed in a mere perfunctory manner, but in the discharge of such duties and the practice of such virtues as are commanded in the sacred Scriptures. In the Saviour’s day there were Pharisees in the city of Jerusalem who delighted in the outward show of religion, but who knew nothing of its inner power,—who made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments, who loved the up-

permost seats at festivals and feasts and the reverential greetings of men in the marketplaces, who were scrupulous in the observance of every minute requirement of that vast system of ceremonial law which had grown up around the original salutary code given at Sinai, who even tithed the mint and anise and cummin with which the dishes upon their tables were seasoned, but who, alas, neglected altogether the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. They followed the traditions of men rather than the commands of God, and the Saviour denounced them as hypocrites. It was not such "good works" that God had commanded, for the prophet Micah had said, "He hath showed thee, O man what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:8).

So also in the time of the Reformers there had grown up a system of external observances which in the eyes of the Church of Rome possessed great merit and which were said to have a value in offsetting the sins of men. The observance of fast days, the recitation of *pater nosters* and *ave marias*, donations to churches and the shrines of the saints, the purchase of indulgences, and other similar practices, all fostered the development of a system of hypocrisy which was utterly at variance with the simplicity and spirituality of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. These things were not the "good works" which God had commanded in His Word, and against them the Reformers raised their earnest protest.

But there were good works commanded by God in sacred Scripture, where the follower of the Lord Jesus is called upon to live a holy life and to put into daily practice the beautiful virtues which our Lord exemplified during the period of His incarnation, and upon these the framers of our confession insisted vigorously. Love to God and fellowmen, charity, kindness, patience, self-denial, forgiveness, a willingness to do unto others as we would have others do unto us,—these are some of the things which God has named as elements of Christian character or rules for Christian conduct, and all such

good works are to be performed. The New Testament is full of exhortations dealing with the practical duties of life. The Sermon on the Mount with its seal of approval upon the commandments of the Decalogue and its admonitions "Judge not that ye be not judged," etc.; the graphic portrayal of the Final Judgment with its "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"; the parable of the "Good Samaritan" with its "Go thou and do likewise"; and many other utterances of our Lord indicate clearly that there are many "good works" which our Lord would have us do. To learn them all it would be necessary for us to read the entire Word of God, but all things there commanded it is our *duty* to do. The Christian is not free from all obligation in this matter merely because his sins are forgiven and he is justified before God, but on the contrary it becomes all the more his duty then to perform these good works which God has commanded.

These good works, however, are not to be performed in expectation of meriting any reward therefore and least of all with the idea that we thereby obtain salvation and eternal life, but merely because it is God's will that we should do them and it is therefore *our duty* so to do.

It is of the utmost importance from every point of view that a man should as far as possible learn God's will with regard to himself, and having learned it, to conform his own life and will to that of his Maker. In the very nature of the case it is utter folly for any human being to seek to go contrary to the purpose for which he was created. Back deep in the mind of the Infinite Creator lay originally the plan and purpose of human life and the ultimate goal and destiny of humanity. All the commands and precepts of the Divine Word are but indications of that divine will and purpose and it is of the utmost importance for each and every man to learn that purpose and to bring his own life into harmony with it. Only thus will he attain unto the best things either here or hereafter.

But to the Christian there are higher considerations. Jesus Christ has revealed God in the character of a

Father and taught us that all the redeemed sustain to him the relation of children. In every properly constituted family *the child obeys the parent*, not because it fears the rod of punishment, but because it loves the parent, because it recognizes the fact that the parent loves the child and desires its highest good, and because it therefore recognizes the *right* of the parent to require implicit and unquestioning obedience. What is true in the human family is pre-eminently true in the family of God. He knows what will be for the best interests of all His children, and He desires only their welfare and happiness. When therefore He speaks to us, as He does in His Word, it is *the duty* of every true child to obey, not in expectation of receiving any reward therefor, but simply because the Father commands it. To the redeemed child of God the commandments are not the stern and harsh edicts of a despot, to which a grudging obedience is to be rendered, but the clear indications of a loving Father's will, which the child is glad to get and anxious to fulfill. The true child of God obeys the commandments because it is God's will that he should do so, because it is his clear duty to do so, and because in his heart there is an abiding *faith* that his Heavenly Father does all things well and asks of His children only those things which are for their own good.

Inasmuch as this relationship of the redeemed child to the Heavenly Father is made possible only by Jesus Christ, and can be enjoyed only by those who believe in Him, the New Obedience may be described properly as the *Fruit of Faith*. The Confession goes further, however, and says that it is the *necessary fruit of faith*. "This faith must bring forth good fruits." It is the very nature of faith to show itself in good works. Hence it is that James says, "Faith without works is dead."

The steps or processes by which the fruit of good works is produced are as plain and as easily traced as are the different stages in the development of the plant. From the grain of corn that is put in the ground there springs, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." From the living faith which lays hold upon Jesus

Christ as the Saviour from sin and death there springs up a beautiful relationship in which the sinful man has been regenerated and made a child of God. As a child of God, he must *think, feel, speak, and act, as a child of God*. As a child of God, he must grow and develop into the full stature of perfect manhood. As a child of God, he must "put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt," and "put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. 4:22-24). All these things are the natural and necessary consequences of a living faith in the heart, and the faith must thus produce its proper fruitage, or like the seed whose development is checked, *it will die*.

Possibly it would be well to call attention to the fact also, that without such faith, it is impossible to bring forth such good works. Faith is the seed. Good works are the fruit. Without the proper seed we cannot hope for the fruition of the harvest time. Men may make artificial representations of the fruit, but it is not the real thing. Men may develop a character which is *morally* correct. But it is not difficult to tell that it is not the genuine article, but only a skillful imitation. God's Word declares, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. 11:6). And again, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23). The germ, therefore, whence spring all works that are really good, is faith—a living, working, justifying faith, which transforms the heart and life and makes of the sinner a child of God.

The spirit of the Christian's obedience is therefore the spirit of filial love and reverence. The motive is a desire to please our kind Father in heaven. The obedience of the child of God is not that of the abject slave who fears the lash of punishment inflicted by the law, but the free and cheerful obedience of the grateful son or daughter who desires to please the Father whose love and care he has enjoyed, and who has loaded them with benefits. It is obedience rendered in the spirit of the boy Jesus who when twelve years of age astonished his parents by asking them the question, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" It is the obedience of the disci-

ple to whom his Lord has said, "*If ye love me, keep my commandments.*"

Let me sum up the entire matter by quoting several brief passages from the writings of that great Reformer whose profound spiritual experiences are interwoven into the Confession and the doctrines of our Church. Luther says:

"By faith alone in Christ, and not by the works of the law, or love, are we declared righteous; not that we reject works and love, as the adversaries accuse us, but that we do not allow ourselves to be diverted from the state of the present case."

"Faith brings with it a band of most beautiful virtues, nor is it ever alone; but on this account, different things are not to be confused, and what belongs to faith alone be ascribed to the rest. Faith is the mother whence these virtues, as children, are born. Unless faith had first embraced the promises concerning Christ, the other virtues would not be present."

"Hence these two sayings are correct: good and godly works never make a good and godly man; but a good and godly man does good works. Evil deeds never make a bad man, but a bad man commits evil deeds."

"We are justified by faith alone, and yet it is never alone."

"Oh, it is a living active, busy thing that we have in faith! It is impossible for one who has faith to do otherwise than incessantly to do good. He asks not whether good works are to be done, but before such a question can be asked, he has done them and is always busy." (Quotations from Jacob's Life of Luther, pp. 362 and 364).

Such then is the New Obedience, an obedience springing out of *faith*, an obedience prompted by *love*, an obedience rendered gladly, cheerfully, *joyfully* by the grateful child to the loving Father in Heaven. May God give His people grace to serve Him in the spirit of this new obedience.

York, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SOCIAL PROGRAM OF LEO XIII.

BY REV. O. H. PANNKOKKE.

The fortunes of the papacy are as strange and varying as are the fortunes of nations. When Leo XIII ascended the papal throne his office had little splendor and influence but abundant opposition, hatred and contempt even among catholic nations. When finally, after a reign exceptional for its length, he passed away, the civilized world, Protestants in instances more than Catholics, heaped eulogies upon him and his position and the institution which he had governed during a perilous time with such singular success. Leo, indeed, was a diplomat of that finished Italian school of diplomacy which more than once rescued the papacy from apparent doom. He knew the value of his influence and the weight of Catholic sentiment amid the difficulties of modern governments and he was able to barter them in exchange for that wider influence on the affairs of the world which the papacy has ever loved so dearly. However, the real significance of his reign lies not here, in the field of diplomacy. It lies rather in the insinuating qualities of his social program which was conceived as the master stroke to gain influence over modern life. Diplomacy dies with the man who practiced it. It is hampered by the party ties which bind its carrier. An idea, a program is free to live, it can seek its adherents and champions among all parties. So the social program of Leo has lived on after his death, has gone out among people opposed to the Church and her principles and won them with its insinuating proposals.

The roots of Leo's program lie far back in history. They date back to the Reformation. To the Catholic the Reformation has ever meant the breakdown of everything good in society. It destroyed government, the family, prosperity, peace, order, faithful application to duty. It brought in anarchy, selfishness, bitter class

struggles, indolence on the part of the lowly, grasping greed on the part of the rulers. Modern society to the Catholic mind is a body filled with noisome distempers, covered with putrescent ulcers, passing through the last paroxysms before death relieves it. One must, of course, bear in mind in reading Catholic expressions, especially official expressions, that their phraseology is the rolling, unctuous bombast of medieval learning handed down from the ancient schools of rhetoric. But even with that qualification the Catholic picture of modern days is dark and hopeless without a ray of light. The great literary representatives of this attack on the Reformation from the social side are Pistorius in the 16th and Doellinger and Janssen in the 19th century, with a host of lesser lights who either followed their pioneer work in smaller special investigations or popularized their contentions.

It is hardly possible to over-estimate the service rendered by these great writers to the social program of Leo. They give it proper setting and background. They provide its fullest apology. Through their preparatory work it receives that impressive, dramatic setting which is so valuable in gaining control over the emotions of the unthinking crowd. For in discussing present day social unrest they are dealing with facts felt and feared by all, in looking to the future with foreboding they are giving expression to sentiments prominent in many minds, and they are using one of the commonest and most effective human appeals when they speak of the golden age that was and is no more. With these two fundamental facts at their disposal it is not very difficult with a credulous audience to shift the blame onto the turning point from medieval to modern life: the Reformation.

Prominent in a discussion of Leo's program must be his analysis of the causes for social disorders. The foremost cause is the overthrow of the holy venerable authority of the Church. Closely akin to that is the passing of the temporal sovereignty. "When the temporal sovereignty of the apostolic see is in question, the cause of the public good and the well being of all human society in general are also at stake." Next to these evils touching more on

the organization of society come a long category of modern principles and ideals which are vigorously condemned and made responsible for the present difficulties. There is the false science which dethroned Thomas of Aquin and the schoolmen. There is education outside of Church control. There is the custom of civil marriage without the sacramental sanction of the Church. All these evils date back to the Reformation. It enthroned reason, founded governments without God, secularized education in universities and common schools and in this latter day leads men to fix eager eyes on the abodes and fortunes of the wealthy. Finally there are adduced a few economic reasons, unchecked competition, rapacious usury and large scale production.

From the religious side this analysis is a proof of papal ambition, power over every side of human life, the political, intellectual and economic no less than the religious. Its social significance is more noteworthy at present. Leo opposes any spontaneous natural growth of society from within to meet the tasks and problems of each succeeding generation. He knows only the ideal of external control. Without that control he cannot conceive of well ordered society. He runs into that grave error so common among traditional thinkers that in judging the present he applies the fixed categories and modes of thoughts of the past and leaves no room for organic changes and growth in human society.

The underlying tendencies of the program become more apparent in seeing what it opposes. Socialism and radicalism head the list. They do that because they propose changes in property right and greater democracy. In connection with them he condemns popular government and the abolition of classes as well as any impatience on the part of the poor with their lot not to speak of attempts to change conditions by force. The paternal interests and efforts of the State also meet with little favor. The solution of the social question is not the sphere of the State, especially not if it goes about it independently of the Church. Still less are economists called upon to pro-

pose remedies unless they have first listened to the teachings of the Church.

After thus clearing the field Leo proceeds to positive ideas and suggestions. The social question is predominantly religious and moral. Its real remedy lies in Christianity as conceived by the Catholic Church. So soon as her sway extends over all, self-interest will be curtailed and mutual love overcome all evils. The rights of private property in all their extent must be protected and the supremacy of the upper classes maintained. Society depends on class distinctions, but the interests of the classes are alike and through Christianity it will not be difficult to make them all join hands in brotherly union. The special duty of the poor is to obey, to practice meekness and submission and be satisfied with their lot. After all this world will always know poverty and a short period of poverty will be followed by eternal bliss. So why be impatient with want. The rich shall be inclined to generosity. Their contribution to the solution of the social question is to practice alms-giving. "Therein lies the best means of appeasing the undying conflict between the rich and the poor." To attain this end the Church officials are urged to enlist the rank, wealth and culture of the community.

The real sufferers from social inequalities and injustice receive very little consideration in this program except the pittance of charity. The program appeals to the rich and powerful. It appeals to their self-interest to keep things as they are and prevent changes which may curtail their power and divide their wealth. It is essentially the program of the extreme conservative which will not permit the slightest change in the organization of industrial society. The great demands of the fourth estate: popular government in the fullest sense of the word and a more equitable distribution of wealth are entirely brushed aside and charity and the hope of eternal bliss are held out where the imperative demand is for justice and equality.

Leo aimed to carry his ideas into practice by fostering labor organizations under the control of the Church.

Especially Germany has had many of these Catholic labor organizations. In Leo's mind they are hardly more than social gatherings where the interests of the group may be discussed without the right to any definite action. And Leo's hope as expressed was that many erring might be brought back into the safe haven of the Church. The really effective weapons were denied them: class solidarity, political action and strikes. In actual operation they developed more and more along the line of routine secular labor bodies. The class spirit developed and was expressed on the floor of their meetings and conventions as vehemently as among the others. Their leaders as well as the rank and file more and more opposed clerical interference and turned the organization into an economic weapon to attain actual results for labor. In America the policy has been rather to control the existing labor organizations and make them conform to the dictates of the Church.

Now who shall carry out this program? Modern society places the responsibility upon the State. Its duties are no more the mere police functions as an earlier day conceived them. But it is called upon to protect as well as foster the physical, mental and moral interests of individuals and groups in society. On the strength of that ever-growing idea were enacted that great body of social laws protecting health, determining hours of labor, protecting special classes against the weight of the industrial system. Leo does not grant the State this right. For him the Church is the real leader in reform. Rulers and governments shall listen to the dictates of the Church, shall carry through by force what the Church cannot attain by suasion. But without the Church there is no salvation. All her officials are urged to take an interest in the matter and use their influence to make the control of the Church supreme.

Stripped of all its embellishments and rhetoric the far-famed social program of Leo XIII looks simple and harmless, in places a bit naive. However, it must be remembered that it appeals to that class which has the balance of power in modern society, the wealthy. Their ideal is

to curtail the power and interference of the State and make the lower classes happy and satisfied with their lot. It is strange how in this world, the possession of wealth inevitably makes men conservative and opposed to change. With the lack of conscience in much of modern business life the insinuating appeal of the Catholic Church to keep things as they are may readily win response and assistance. It is reported that the society for the propagation of the faith has actually sent out letters of appeal to prominent non-Catholic financiers appealing for financial assistance on the ground that the Catholic Church is the best insurance against radicalism. In the current literature of the Catholic Church that appeal is not strange. It is one of the stock phrases. To worry about business men's souls who will join a Church on such grounds is hardly worth while. The only question of interest in the situation is an academic one: Have they a soul at all? Still less is it worth while to be envious of a Church which gains influence in this way. But what effect has this program on the natural growth and progress of society? The two definite lines of development in society are on the one hand to make the ideal of democracy conceived a century ago real and to bring about a more just distribution of wealth. Stated in another way, it is the emancipation of the workingman to a position of political influence and just wealth. The demand of the workingman is just and succeeding years have brought him closer and closer to his goal besides giving him that self-respect and confidence which is the essential of success. The grave danger in the situation lies in the possibility of forcibly retarding this progress that it will no more be a natural peaceful evolution but a destructive revolution bringing suffering upon all. Whether Catholic influence will be strong enough to bring about this situation only the future can tell. One thing is clear in a survey of the present social unrest, a great factor is the social program of Leo XIII with its appeal to the self-interest of the well-to-do.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION.

Was it a Revelation or an Evolution?

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

We have been moved to write this article by the reading and re-reading of Frederick William Bade's recently published book, "The Old Testament in the Light of Today." The book belongs to the class of the radical criticism, and is one of the most negative works we have ever read. Dr. Bade is the professor of Old Testament Literature and Semitic Languages in Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, California. After reading all his slashing criticisms of the Old Testament, its moral teaching, its theology and its history, we could not help wondering why a man holding such views should want to be a teacher in a theological school founded by Christian people (it was founded by the Congregationalists, though now it is non-denominational), and especially why he should want to be a teacher of the Old Testament. Students trained for the ministry under such a regime surely cannot go out in the world with much of a message. The author not only represents the Old Testament as a very defective book morally and religiously, even a very wicked book in some ways, but also thinks that Christ's disciples corrupted the teachings of their Master after His departure from them. Thus it would seem that there is not much of the Bible left for the student who graduates from the Pacific Seminary, if he swallows the teaching of Professor Bade.

The author's liberalism is also made obvious from the men who have commended his work and to whom he refers with "grateful acknowledgments" in his preface. Among them are Karl Marti, Dr. Charles F. Aked and Winston Churchill, the last the author of "The Inside of the Cup." Besides, a circular from the publishers contains an enthusiastic endorsement of the book by Mr. Churchill. This writer of fiction with a theological coloring displays his critical depth and intelligence by saying

of Dr. Bade's book, "Above all, it is constructive." We wonder what Mr. Churchill's ideas of "constructive" teaching are, anyway; for after reading through the book, we are moved to say that, according to the author, the Old Testament is about as worthless a production as was ever foisted upon a long-suffering world.

The author's position may also be seen from the list of authorities he cites, especially in a footnote on page 88. Among them are the following: Budde, Cornill, Kuenen, Marti, Oort, Snend, W. R. Smith, H. P. Smith, Stade, Steuernagel and Wellhausen. Even though Kuenen's and Stade's works were published away back in 1877-1887, Dr. Bade still cites them as authorities. But throughout his whole work he never makes a single allusion to such conservative authors as Keil, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Klostermann, Orelli, Moeller, Cave, Orr, Girdlestone, Urquhart, Green, McGarvey, Robertson (of Glasgow), Wiener, Wilson, et al. So completely does he ignore the conservative and evangelical Old Testament scholars (except to scoff at their views and misrepresent them) that the reader would think there were so few of them as to be a negligible quantity. Compare with this studied avoidance of evangelical writers the method of Dr. William Henry Green in his great work, "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," who uses over two pages in citing the books referred to in his volume; among them are nearly all the liberal authors from Astruc to Kuenen; and, of course, to be fair, he also cites a fine list of evangelical scholars. Note also the extensive bibliography on pages 543-547, over four pages of fine print, in Dr. James Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament." We simply make these comparisons to show the difference between the methods of a radical and a conservative critic. Dr. Orr's list contains nearly every author, conservative and liberal, who, up to 1905, had ever done anything noteworthy in Old Testament research.¹ No wonder Dr. Bade goes on

1. Here it might be well to call attention to the great list of conservative Biblical scholars who have written for "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," edited by Dr. Orr and others and published within the last year.

repeating the old, threadbare objections to the Old Testament as if they had not been answered by evangelical scholars again and again.

Our purpose, however, is not to give a general critique of Dr. Bade's work, but to call attention to his main view-point, which forms the keystone to the whole structure he has erected. Nowhere does he accept the Old Testament at its own estimate, or from its own point of view, but he reconstructs its whole history to fit it into his own scheme of evolution. A number of citations will indicate both the spirit and the view-point of the author. As we proceed, we shall offer some remarks on the quotations.

In beginning his preface he says that the "one thing of supreme importance, actually and historically, is the idea of God." It is tautological to say "actually and historically," for when a thing is historical, it is actual. Then he adds concerning the idea of God: "This idea did not come in full feather, nor fall as a bolt from the blue." Both these expressions are slangy, and therefore are not in good taste, especially right at the beginning of a work on so serious and important a subject. Besides, they are intended as a gibe at the orthodox view. But, as is almost always the case with the girds of the liberalist, it is an untrue representation of the convictions held by conservative scholars. Not one of them that we know of has ever held that the idea of God "came in full feather." An outstanding principle of conservative historical criticism is that the revelation of God in the Bible was progressive; that God led His people along from point to point, making His revelation fuller and fuller all the way. Everybody knows, even those who make no pretense to scholarship, that the Old Testament was preparatory, and that God unfolded His plan by degrees until the "fullness of time" came. So in the second sentence of his book Dr. Bade has misrepresented the orthodox position, and has set up a man of straw. Not a very promising beginning for a book which, according to Winston Churchill, is "above all constructive."

A few sentences further on, the author says: "The

helpful teacher of the Old Testament now employs the higher achievements of Israel's religion as grave-diggers for the defunct moral crudities that have dropped by the way. The usual procedure has been to embalm them with a 'Thus saith the Lord,' and to carry them along until the living expire under the dead."

Here is another fling at both the Bible and orthodoxy. Yes, a fling at the Bible, because it contains the expression, "Thus saith the Lord," many times, and Dr. Bade will simply have to cast aside all such Biblical announcements as delusions or impostures. Of course he does this without conscience, for wherever the Biblical teaching contravenes his theory, he simply throws the Biblical teaching incontinently overboard. Note, too, how disrespectfully he speaks of some portions of the religion of Israel as "defunct moral crudities." No wonder, for afterward he surely does represent the Old Testament morality as woefully distorted. His fling at orthodoxy consists in his saying: "The usual procedure has been to embalm those moral crudities." That is scorn, not argument. Conservative scholars embalm no moral crudities. They teach that God adapted both His revelation and His leading to the unfolding mental and moral capacities of His people during their progressive development.

In the author's "Introduction" he says: "Two views of the Old Testament still contend for mastery among the adherents of Christianity. The one regards it as a sort of talisman, miraculously given and divinely authoritative on the subject of God, religion and morals in every part. The other regards it as a growth, in which the moral sanctions in each stage of development were succeeded and displaced by the next higher one."

Let us pause a moment to consider this. Wherever the author can use a word to cast discredit on the conservative view he does not fail to do so. Note the word talisman above. Did men like Keil, Hengstenberg, Orr, Cave and Green look upon the Bible as a sort of "talisman"? Is it to be supposed that all the living evangelical theologians and ministers and scholarly laymen in our evan-

gelical churches use the Bible in that way? No; every one should know, if every one does not, that they see nothing magical in the Bible, nor do they use it for purposes of superstition. They regard it as a special divine revelation—one that the good and holy God gave to mankind for their enlightenment in the way of salvation. To impute superstition to such people is to advertise one's lack of acquaintance with them. He also girds at the view that the Old Testament was "miraculously given and divinely authoritative." Well, that is what the Book claims for itself. If its claim from beginning to end is put on a false basis, why does not Dr. Bade simply come out as an infidel like Voltaire, Paine or Ingersoll, and reject it *in toto*. Why stand up for a Book that is fundamentally false throughout?

This author will not tolerate the view that any part of the Old Testament was given by direct divine revelation and inspiration. No, it is a "growth," a "human growth," a "development of human thought." Let us quote (page 18 of the "Introduction"): "With respect to much in Hebrew religion the student has done his full duty when he has traced its origin and assigned it a place in the development of human thought. There are intellectual conceptions, moral ideals, motives and rites, which, in spite of their divine sanctions, have fortunately forever fallen below our moral horizon." Page 19: "Since religion in primitive times was not a body of abstract beliefs, but concretely a part of almost all that we would class as general culture in the form of tribal institutions and customs, and since primitive culture undeniably has, by a long process of evolution developed into modern civilization, it follows inevitably that religion has shared this process of progressive development. It passed by stages from the crudest expressions of religious instinct, in nature, ancestor and fetish worship, to the exalted form in which it has expressed itself in the teachings of Jesus." Page 20: "No less is the history of morality in Hebrew religion a history of human growth, which exhibits, on the one hand, a process in man; on the other, a progress in idea and institution. The process is the growing fitness of the vehicle of

revelation. The progress is the growing moral perfection of the religion. Needless to say, the conception of revelation that underlies this study regards it as an illumination from within, not as a communication from without; as an educative, not an instructional, process." On page 21 he regards the literary analysis of the partition critics as having settled the dates of the various books of the Old Testament and also the view of their composite character. Then he adds: "This knowledge naturally has become the basis for a reinterpretation of Hebrew morals and religion in terms of development."

On pages 12 and 13 the author gives his ideas of revelation. He quotes Trench's definition, which is as follows: "God's revelation of Himself is a drawing back of the veil or curtain which concealed Him from men; not man finding out God, but God discovering Himself to man." Then Dr. Bade says: "Against the word 'revelation' so understood we wish to enter an early protest. Thoughtful men everywhere are abandoning this old conception, which came in as a correlate to the transcendent idea of God, and to a world-view that has been outgrown. A God apart from the world was necessarily believed to reveal Himself from without, objectively. . . . It is a different world of thought in which men are now living. . . . The change from transcendence to immanence in our thought of God has involved the corresponding transition from an objective to a subjective theory of revelation. . . . Not through the medium of external agencies, but in and through personality does God reveal Himself to men."

Enough quotations have been given to show how utterly the author is committed to the theory of evolution, and that to him the idea of a direct divine revelation is intolerable. What is to be said respecting this hypothesis?

The first thing we note is that the whole Old Testament history must be manipulated, reversed and reconstructed to suit the theory. Instead of accepting the history as it stands in the Bible, as tradition has believed it to be through all the centuries, and as Josephus substantially narrated it, with Genesis leading and the rest of the books

following in the natural order to make a consecutive narrative, Dr. Bade, following the dissecting critics, turns the whole history about. Of Moses (1300-1200 B. C.) there are "no authentic literary remains" (page 22 of the Introduction). "Probably few Old Testament scholars would now venture to claim a genuinely Mosaic origin for even the smallest literary fragments of the Pentateuch" (page 18). "Early traditions and songs" are assigned to 1200 to 1000 B. C., and these fragments are part of the song of Deborah, David's lament of over Saul, parts of Jacob's blessing, Jotham's fable, and the speeches of Balaam. The J document, consisting of "materials scattered through the Pentateuch and Joshua," was written in 850; the E document is dated 750 B. C.; Amos, Hosea, Isaiah (Chapters 1-39) and J and E compiled into a single document, 650; Micah comes next; D (Deuteronomy), *circa* 650-621; JE combined with D, 560; P (Priest code), 550-450; Pentateuch completed (JEDP) 420; Daniel 165; Esther 150. We have given only a part of this critical program, for the author assigns to each book of the Old Testament what he regards as its proper place.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the whole Old Testament history is transposed. Instead of treating it as it stands in the Bible, each event falling in its proper place in consecutive historical order, he splits up the narrative, assigning one section or paragraph to one date and another to another date perhaps centuries later. The whole Biblical narrative is thus treated as if it were a mosaic, a hodgepodge, instead of an organism. Is there in all the world another piece of history or literature that has been composed in this way? What would we think of an author who would accord such treatment to the history of Egypt, Greece, Rome or Mohammedanism? And why is all this confusion wrought in the Biblical history? Solely in the interest of the author's pet theory of evolution. According to that theory, the exalted teaching about God in the opening chapter of Genesis, His unity, His creation of the universe, etc., could not have been conceived in the primitive times; therefore that narrative must be brought down to a late date in order to fit into the evolu-

tionary program. Is that historical criticism? Is it not rather manipulating the historical data so as to make it fit into a preconceived and subjective theory? Whatever may be said of this method, it is not scientific, for the inductive method, which is the scientific method, first takes into account all the facts as it finds them, and then formulates its theory. We accuse Dr. Bade, and the whole Wellhausen school to which he belongs, of using the *a priori* method, in spite of all their pretensions to using the inductive or *a posteriori* method. It is a clear case of what the Greeks would have called a *hysteron proteron*—of putting the conclusion before the premises.

We wish here to emphasize the fact that Dr. Bade's mode of treatment means a decisive rejection of the testimony of the Bible itself. He will not have it that God ever directly manifested Himself to any of the Old Testament characters. Everything, according to Bade, is simply the evolution of subjective human ideas. If God ever made any revelation of Himself or His will, He did it merely through the imperfect subjective impressions of men, who made many mistakes of a very serious nature. By the way, that would be a queer kind of divine revelation! But what is the testimony of the Bible on this point? Does it teach that God revealed Himself directly or only by means of subjective experiences? Every Bible reader will tell you the former. The Bible says God spoke directly to Adam and Eve, to Cain, to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, and all the prophets. If there is anything plain and outstanding in the Bible, it is that God gave special objective revelations of Himself at intervals throughout the whole Old Testament history.

"Oh! but that is all a mistake of the writers of the various documents!" asserts the critic. "Either they credulously accepted the traditions and myths of the primitive times or else they purposely colored the narratives."

All right, then. That indicates the precise position of the critic. He pointedly rejects the explicit testimony of the Bible. His quarrel, then, is with the Bible. Why

not just come out and say so? Why turn upon orthodox theologians, as if they were responsible for putting the Bible in its present form? Whether such a critic has the truth on his side or not, he ought to be classified as an unbeliever rather than as an evangelical theologian.

However, what is the bearing of the critic's own theory on the doctrine of evolution? It eviscerates it, and for this reason: Suppose, as the critic maintains, the view of a direct revelation of God belongs to a very crude and primitive age, the age of mythology; and suppose, again, that the Pentateuch was not completed until *circa* 420 B. C.; then we want to ask why, in the name of reason and common sense, the advanced editors, whoever they were, did not eliminate the narratives of direct revelations and miracles, and tell the people that the whole history of the world and of Israel was merely the result of "the development of human thought?" Either they knew that the history they were giving the people was untrue, or they did not know it. If they thought they were writing the truth, when it was not the truth, what becomes of the theory of evolution? At so late a date evolution should have had a more enlightening effect upon them. Instead of that, they actually thought they were reciting a true narrative of God's direct revelations to His people. If they knew that the traditional belief was not true, they imposed a mendacious history and world-view upon their fellow-Jews; and the people accepted their representation as a special revelation from God! Again we ask why evolution did not clear the minds of the people at so late a date as 420 B. C. of those simple and primitive ideas of a God who made a direct revelation? Surely evolution proved itself to be a very deficient teacher. But that is not all. Even in the time of Christ the Jews, and Christ Himself, believed that the Old Testament contains a true narrative of a special divine revelation. And even to-day there are millions of Jews and Christians who hold firmly to the view of a special divine revelation in the Old Testament. If this is all that evolution can do, its effectiveness is surely very questionable.

Yet it is on account of this very theory of evolution that the critics assign most of the Old Testament composition to a late date, so that they can give development plenty of time to develop! We insist on knowing why the editors and redactors of 600-420 B. C. did not construct the history and religion of the Pentateuch and the other Biblical books prior to their time according to the theory of evolution instead of according to the primitive and traditional view. We will tell you just why: The theory of evolution is not the true view. It is illogical. It is built on the wrong foundation. It is based on false premises and *non sequitur* modes of reasoning.

Now, this is the main proposition to be proved—that evolution is a futile theory, is not adequate to its task, and is disproved by history, science and religion. Suppose we look at the history of nations. Go back in the annals of almost all the nations of the earth—those that have any annals and have left any archaeological remains—and what do you find? Evidences of a high civilization. Note what is being found in Egypt, Babylonia, Palestine, Greece, Rome. Pyramids, palaces, aqueducts, towers, monuments, cuneiform tablets, legal codes—all these bear testimony that nations long before the historic period began outside of the Bible were wonderfully advanced in the arts of enlightenment. Even in Turkestan recent explorations have unearthed the remains of great cities, with their telltale evidences of a marvellous ancient civilization. The same kind of discoveries have been made among the ruins of the Aztecs of Mexico, the Toltecs of Central America and the Incas of Peru. Some of us can remember how Wendell Phillips was wont to thrill us with his lecture on “The Lost Arts.” Some of the arts of these ancient civilizations are “lost” even to the present day. Therefore we maintain that the story of nations, so far as it can be traced by both history and archeology, does not point to a period of primeval savagery, but the reverse. And that fact invalidates the theory of evolution.

The like is true of the history of religion. It is a well known fact, brought out by Max Muller, Orr, and many

other writers, that the further back you trace most of the ethnic religions, the more nearly they approach to pure monotheism. The discovery of the Egyptian "Book of the Dead," the most ancient bit of Egyptian literature yet found, corroborates this statement, for it shows that the most ancient ritual of that nation asserted the view of only one God. A similar claim can be upheld for the religions of India, China and Persia. The evolutionists often aver that the primitive religion of mankind was fetichism or animism. This cannot be proved. There is *not one example* on record of a nation that has evolved by its own efforts from animism through polytheism to monotheism. On this point we quote from Principal Fairbairn, who, in speaking of the evolutionists, says: "They assume a theory of development that has not a single historical instance to verify it. Examples are wanted of people who have grown, without foreign influence, from atheism to Fetichism, and from it through the intermediate stages into Monotheism; and until such examples be given, hypotheses claiming to be 'Natural Histories of Religion' must be judged as hypotheses still."

("Studies in the Philosophy of Religion," p. 12.)

Here is also a relevant passage from Dr. James Orr's "The Christian View of God and the World," page 75: "Volkmar has remarked that of monotheistic religions there are only three in the world—the Israelitish, the Christian and the Mohammedan; and the last named is derived from the other two... This limitation of Monotheism in religion to the peoples who have benefitted by the Biblical teaching on this subject suggests its origin from a higher than human source; and refutes the contention of those who would persuade us that the monotheistic idea is the result of a long process of development through which the race necessarily passes, beginning with Fetichism, or perhaps Ghost-worship, mounting to Polytheism, and ultimately subsuming the multitude of divine powers under one all-controlling will. It will be time enough to accept this theory when, outside the line of the Biblical development, a single nation can be pointed to which has gone through these stages and reached this

goal." We would also refer the reader to Dr. Orr's pertinent notes on pages 409-414; also to Dr. Tisdall's two scholarly books, "Christianity and Other Faiths" and "Comparative Religion"; Valentine's "Natural Theology" is very good on this thesis.

Let us look at the facts without prejudice. There is plenty of evidence in history and archeology of the degeneration of both civilization and religion. The decay and disappearance of nations afford abundant proof. There is not one instance of any people advancing by its own efforts from the lower forms of religion to the higher. On the other hand, the evidence all points to the fact that the further back we pursue our historical study of religions, the more nearly they approach the monotheistic conception. These things being true, what is the most adequate theory to account for all the facts? It would be that the original idea of God was Monotheism, and that the lower and baser religious conceptions are decadent forms. We do not need to have the Bible to prove that sin, superstition and spiritual darkness are in the world, and these would account for the human tendency to degeneration in religion. At all events, such a tendency is an outstanding empirical fact. Even in Christian lands there are periods of religious decline. All forms and ideas, however pure at first, are liable to become perverted and perfunctory. By simply accepting facts as we find them in all the world, we see that the conception of primitive monotheism and the tendency to deterioration afford the most adequate theory. And with this empirical fact the teaching of the Bible agrees fully. In the beginning God revealed Himself as the one true God; but sin came into the world, and men degenerated, and fell into lower and lower forms of superstition. To this tendency to idolatry the Jews were also subject, and it was only by special revelations of Himself that God was able to keep alive in the world the true original monotheistic religion. Here is a view that is adequate, that tallies with the facts, and that therefore is the only scientific hypothesis.

In the next place, we will proceed to convict Dr. Bade

out of his writings of disloyalty to his own theory of evolution. He calls Amos and Hosea "pioneers of a new era" and Isaiah (Chapters 1-39) "the prophet of holiness." The first two came very near, at times at least, to preaching true monotheism, and both they and Isaiah proclaimed a very high type of morality. Of course, according to the modern critic, they had not thrown off the shackles entirely; yet they were comparatively free from the monolatry and ritualism of the rest of the Jews. Now note: According to Bade, Amos and Hosea prophesied 750-735 B. C. and Isaiah 740-700. However, the Priests' Code (P), including Leviticus, etc., was not written until 550-450—that is, from 200 to 300 years after the prophets named above. Yet the Priest's Code was a reversion to the ritualism that had been so severely condemned by those prophets! Here, according to Bade himself, there was deterioration instead of evolution.

In another way our critic invalidates his development theory. He holds that the later prophets got away from the idea of a direct revelation of God, and held to the view which Bade himself champions, namely, that God operates only immanently through the conceptions of men. Well, those prophets wrote from 750 to 460 B. C. (*circa*, of course, for everything is guess work). But, lo and behold! the Pentateuch was not completed until (*circa*) 420 B. C., 40 years after the last of the prophets. And now these final editors and redactors of the Pentateuch, writing nearly a half century after the last of the prophets and more than three centuries after the first, did not construct it according to the high ideals of immanent revelation held by the prophets, but actually throughout the whole book represented God as given direct and objective manifestations. Worse yet for the theory of evolution, the conceptions of the Pentateuchal redactors prevailed in Israel. Here is surely an acute case of degeneration. According to Bade's own representation, therefore, the evolution theory did not work in the history of the Israelitish nation.

Bade also argues that Amos and Hosea came very near teaching pure monotheism, and denounced the narrow

Jahvism (the idea that Jehovah was only a national god) of the Israelites prior to that time. But these prophets flourished 750-735 B. C. Two hundred years later the Priests' Code was written, and was accepted by Israel; yet this code inculcated the old crude Jahvism or mono-latry instead of the advanced theism of the prophets. Another case of reversion instead of evolution. If evolution does not serve the disintegrating critics better than this, what advantage has it over the evangelical view?

But we convict our author once more out of his own book of being untrue to his favorite hypothesis. On pages 7-10 he tries to prove that Christ Himself was a critic of the Old Testament, rejecting portions of its teaching, and substituting a higher and truer view. We think he misrepresents Christ here, but that is not the point just now. Then on page 10 Dr. Bade adds: "Passing on to the apostles, one finds, strangely enough, that they narrowed the scope of criticism, if they did not deny it altogether. They apparently accepted the moral criticism applied to the Old Testament by Jesus, but they also believed in the literal inspiration of the text. A thorough comprehension and acceptance of Jesus' principles would have prevented the apostles from binding themselves and their converts once more to the letter of the Jewish Scriptures. They did not, could not, fully comprehend." That is, here again evolution would not work. It should have enabled the apostles to go right forward developing Christ's higher critical ideas and principles. Instead of evolution, there was reversion here once more. The apostles went back to the Old Testament conception of an objective revelation instead of the nebulous "immanent" unfolding of "human thought." The apostles should not have been so stubborn. More than that, they proved Christ (whom Bade seems to want to accept as a true teacher) to be a false prophet, for He promised that the Holy Spirit would "lead them into all truth." Why did not the immanent Spirit of God lead them immanently in the right and the promised way, the all-prevailing way of evolution? Even the Holy Spirit became obstinate!

We have shown that the history of nations, their civili-

zations and religions disprove the hypothesis of evolution. So does human biography. Here we need not take the Bible as our guide, but need only to glance at the pages of secular history. In Greece most of the truly great men came too soon for the theory of evolution. Homer, who flourished about 1000 B. C., had no contemporaries or successors who were his equals in epic poetry. He should have been obliging enough to wait for evolution to develop him at the proper psychological moment. And there are Pericles, the greatest in statesmanship, Euripides, in tragic poetry, Phidias, in sculpture, Demosthenes, in oratory, and that triumvirate of philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle—all of them came prematurely, and so do not fit into the evolution hypothesis; for they were born, lived, wrought and died, without leaving successors who were their equals. The same may be said of Rome with her Cicero, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius. Other nations gave the world its Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe, Schiller, Washington and Lincoln long before the strategic moment had come to prove the pet theory of the day to be a verified hypothesis. Human history is a rather recalcitrant pupil in the school of evolution.

It is interesting to note that Biblical history follows in this respect the same regime as secular history. Here and there recur conspicuous characters as beacon lights for the rest of the world, standing almost alone in the sphere of spirituality—Enoch, Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah; then in the New Testament Christ came “in the fullness of time” according to the divine plan, but, if evolution is true, very much out of season. In this respect Biblical and secular history coincide—they do not display a uniform progressive process, but exhibit individuals who stand head and shoulders above their contemporaries and describe alternating periods of civil and religious advance and decline.

Thus we think we have shown that the religion of Israel cannot be accounted for on the theory of mere psychological evolution. That hypothesis is not adequate, and is therefore unscientific. If evolution must be given

up, what view shall we accept? We know of only one view that is adequate, and that is, the Bible is a divine revelation, as it claims to be. Since evolution has proved itself insufficient, it is no longer necessary to rearrange the books of the Old Testament or reconstruct its history, but we can simply let everything stand as we find it in the Bible.

Suppose now, instead of being atomistic and picayunish in our criticism, we take the large, the comprehensive view of the Biblical system as a *Weltanschauung*, and see whether it is not rational, and at the same time so wonderful a scheme as to afford a presumption that it must be an especially revealed plan. First, there is the idea of God as the personal Creator as set forth in the first and second chapters of Genesis. How marvellous it is that any one living in that remote age should be able to get such a conception! There is not another cosmogony in the world that begins with God as a personal Being and the Creator of the cosmos. All heathen cosmogonies represent the gods as coming from the world or the primordial impersonal essence of things. How does it happen that the Bible alone of all ancient books gives us this clear monotheistic conception, and the view of God as the Creator? Even the wisest philosophers of Greece and Rome did not rise to this exalted conception. The only sufficient way to account for the amazing fact is that God Himself revealed the truth to some one; and that is what the Bible teaches.

The creation of man in the divine image is another wonderful idea that man could not have discovered by his own thinking. Remarkable, too, is the conception that he was created a free moral agent, with power to choose between good and evil. Here is an ethical view of man that will account for all the facts of history. When man fell into sin by his own volition, what human ingenuity could have devised or discovered a plan by which he might be rescued by divine love and mercy, without setting aside and dishonoring the divine and eternal law of justice. Yet we find all the Old Testament history and symbolism leading up to "the fullness of time" when God sent His

Son, "born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law." Thus, according to this profound world-view, God was "able to be just and the justifier of every one that believeth on His Son." The Old Testament begins with Paradise formed and lost; the New Testament ends with Paradise restored and regained. So the Bible is all one great unified plan, comprehending all facts, all needs, all aspirations, all moral and spiritual imperatives. Could so marvelous and profound a scheme ever have been the mere evolution of human thinking? We do not believe it. It has been divinely revealed. In this connection we would re-echo the inspired conception of the prophet (Isa. 55:8, 9): "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

ARTICLE IX.

THE SCOPE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

BY CHARLES WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, A.M., S.T.D.

THE DEFINITION.

Dr. Coe says the factors involved in the idea of education are these: "An immature being, a goal or destiny for life, and older human beings who can help the younger to realize this goal or destiny."¹ Dr. Coe also shows that at times, particularly in the past, educators over-emphasized the adult viewpoint. In other words, so much stress was laid upon adult experiences that these results became the standards of education. Adult views are necessary for educational development, but to lay undue emphasis upon them to the exclusion of other ideas will prevent genuine progressive growth. Naturally the goal sought after under such circumstances was to over-emphasize the destiny of man. This was the view of medieval education. Religious education, then, under the control of the Church was fostered along narrow lines of development. Medieval religion as well as education were not "broad enough to include everything that is worthy of being a part of our temporal life." Religion and education alike had as their one goal the salvation of souls from eternal punishment.

Guided by these narrow ideals educators forgot to take into account the child life as one of the chief elements in the development of education. However modern educators such as Pestalozzi, Froebel and others brought out the importance of studying the child mind. They recognized the fact that for education to accomplish the most for mankind it must be cognizant of the laws and experiences of childhood as well as of the adult life. Education is a progressive development in which the whole personality is involved.

1 Education in Religion and Morals—pp. 11 and 12.

During the last few years so much has been written about the importance of child study that it has been over-emphasized. It has resulted in a tendency to lose sight of the real purpose of child education. At the present time we note a change coming in the educational world. The study of child life is coming to its proper place and sphere.

In view of this discussion the question arises, what is education? It will be in order to give the opinion of several prominent educators.

Education is the sum of the reflective efforts by which we aid nature in the development of the physical, intellectual and moral faculties of man, in view of his perfection, his happiness and his social destination.—J. G. Compayre, *Lectures on Pedagogy* (Boston 1893) pages 126.

“To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge.”—Herbert Spencer, *Education*.

“If education cannot be identified with mere instruction, what is it? What does the term mean? I answer, it must mean a gradual adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race.”—Butler, *The Meaning of Education*, page 17.

“The true end of teaching is one with the true aim of life; and each lesson must be presented with the conscious purpose of making the most out of the life of the one taught.”—Arnold Tompkins—*The Philosophy of Teaching*, page 71.

“Education, in short, cannot be better described than by calling it the organization of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies to behavior.”—William James, *Talks to Teachers*, page 29.

These definitions which we have quoted give the viewpoint of education in general. Present day educational principles are the outgrowth of the development of the progress of the world in the past. Present and past achievements for the truth lay the foundations for the future. History shows that educational progress has advanced along two great lines,—the psychological and sociological. The basic is the psychological side. The child

mind and not the adult forms the basis of educational principles. The Master Teacher showed this significant fact when he said "Suffer the little children to come unto me." As has already been mentioned, it remained for modern educators and religionists to readjust the psychology of education to the ideal of the Master. The child has his distinctive tendencies, experiences, etc., which must be studied and understood and educated, if later, as a man, he is to do his part in perpetuating the ideals of Christian civilization.

The sociological side of education is an off-shoot of the psychological. The social side of the child nature is an inheritance of the tendencies of the past, both primitive and civilized. The sociological part of education is a work for the present and the future. The instinctive tendencies of the child life are to be trained and developed so that they may be adapted to the best physical environment and civilizing elements. On this point Butler says: "Natural forces play no small part in adapting human beings to both elements (physical and civilized) of environment, but the process of education is especially potent as regards adaptation to the second element, civilization. Civilization—man's spiritual environment, all his surroundings which are not directly physical—this it is which has to be conquered, in its elements at least before one can attain a true education."²

The two great historic elements education and the Christian religion have fostered, developed, and given to us our present day civilization. Dr. Butler has well said that the child born into the present day civilization comes into a five-fold inheritance bequeathed to him by the past and for him to be truly educated he must have a knowledge of each one of these elements, as well as insight into them all and sympathy with them all.

The summary of his classification is as follows:³

(1). The scientific inheritance, by which man is entitled to know and understand nature by utilizing all the

2 Principles of Religious Education—p. 5.

3 The Meaning of Education—Butler—pp. 17-34.

resources of modern scientific method. He is entitled to know about the world from the viewpoint of the earlier peoples and what is ours today. It is the basis of a liberal education.

(2). The literary inheritance. The great literary treasures and storehouses of culture of the past are to be mastered through the study of language. Literature shows the progressive development of the peoples of the world which can only be understood and interpreted by the study of language. Though important as is the study of this great literary inheritance yet it narrows education to say this study alone is sufficient. It is to go hand in hand with the scientific inheritance in the early life of the child, during the period of plasticity or education.

(3). The aesthetic inheritance. The aesthetic spirit which engenders the feeling for the beautiful and the sublime history shows it occupied a prominent phase in the early history of the human race. It was developed and fostered by the Greeks. Later narrow religious ideals sought to suppress all feelings for the beautiful. But it was impossible. Ideals of art and beauty were given expression in the construction of Gothic cathedrals and the pictures of the painters of the Renaissance. The importance of aesthetic training is recognized to-day as one of the factors in giving the child a true education and perpetuating the ideals of civilization.

(4). The institutional inheritance. The history of the world shows three types of political ideals. The one which shows the individual to be of no importance, but only the great mass of the people are to be considered, that is individuality must be pressed down for the advantage of the whole. Then there is the type which is shown in extreme individualism which will not take into consideration the welfare of society as a whole but seeks to make the individual sufficient unto himself. The true type is neither extreme. It gives individuality worth, place and consideration, but makes it subservient, and responsible to law, the welfare of society and existing institutions. This is the type which our children are to follow if our civilization of the future is to grow and develop.

(5). The religious inheritance. Religion in some form or another is common alike to both primitive and civilized people. History of the past testifies to this fact as well as at the present time. The religious inheritance of the race is a rich one. This is true particularly of Christianity in the ideals it has contributed to the advancement of civilization and culture. Religion always played a prominent part in education though sometimes its spirit was narrow, illiberal and uninformed. Events of comparative recent times have resulted in the separation of religion from education.

The growth of the public school system in the United States has witnessed the divorcement of all religious instruction from the schools. The result is our present plan of educational development is not meeting adequately the needs of the child.

Since the importance of religious education is generally recognized it is fitting that we should define it. *The ideal of religious education is the development of the highest form of individual character which is to be interpreted in terms of unselfish service for God and mankind.*

When the Master gave the command "Go ye forth and teach," Matt. 28:19-20, He laid stress upon a great educational truth. His own life and mission exemplified this educational ideal. He impressed this message upon his disciples and finally upon his followers to teach. What was the basis of His teaching? Unselfish service for God and fellowman. This is the central truth of Christianity. It is based upon the highest form of character moulded in spirit and in truth after the life of the perfect Teacher. "Character," says J. S. Mill, "is a completely fashioned will." James defines it as a "huddle of habits." The definition as stated by James sets forth the idea we have in mind which we have set forth in our definition of religious education, namely,—the habit of service which comes through training every tendency of the individual personality which shall find expression in unselfish service for God and men. "No matter how full a reservoir of *maxims* we may possess, no matter how good one's *sentiments* may be, if we have not taken advantage of every concrete

opportunity to *act* one's character may remain entirely unaffected for the better."⁴ The key note of religious education is to develop the highest form of individual character which will seek active expression in the form of unselfish service.

RELIGION AND EDUCATION.

In theory religion and education may be separated from each other, but in reality such a thought is impossible. The aim and goal of education and religion are virtually the same. The basis of true education is religion and any effort to make education independent of religion narrows its scope, aim and goal. True education seeks to develop the whole personality. This is the ideal which education must ever have before it and to which it must tenaciously hold. The religious ideal is also concerned in the whole personality. Every volitional, emotional and intellectual tendency it is to touch, develop and bring out to the highest possible form. No child who has lacked a careful and thorough training in education and religion upon reaching maturity can be expected to do his full duty to God, his fellowman and to himself. Dr. King has aptly written: "The highest conceivable culture, therefore, would be the culture that should enable a man to enter with appreciation and conviction with the deepest and most significant personal life of history; and the world is coming to see with greater clearness every day that that life is the life of Jesus Christ."⁵

THE FACTORS.

There are three important educational factors which help to give the child that true instruction for him to do his full duty in life, i. e., (1) the school; (2) the home; (3) the Church.

4 Psychology. James, Vol. I—p. 125.

5 Personal and Ideal Elements In Education—p. 78.

THE SCHOOL.

According to the interpretation of our constitution, religion cannot be taught in our public schools. In the United States, Church and State are separate and independent of each other, but yet a reciprocal relation exists between them. We have already written about the supreme importance and spheres of religion in order to make up an all round and efficient education. There is but one conclusion to reach with respect to our public schools which leads us to say that its educational work, therefore, is inadequately incomplete.

We recognize the importance of reading the Bible in the schools, but we cannot call this exercise a religious instruction nor would we want it designated by such a term. Where this reading is done with discrimination and without comment on the choice and splendid portions of Scriptures, which should always be read, we believe great good can be accomplished in many ways. This reading may not be instructive in the analytic sense, but the mind of the pupil is impressed with the beauty and simplicity of God's Word and we sincerely believe a thirst will be awakened in the heart of the child for a greater knowledge of the Word.

There are many educators and religionists who advocate the study of religion in the public schools. They make a contradistinction between teaching religion and denominationalism. They advocate that religious instruction based on board general terms of religious concepts free from doctrinal, creedal and denominational interpretations could be put into the school curriculum. We realize there is much force and consideration given to their argument but we cannot see the feasibility of the plan. We believe in the broad interpretation of religion for it to be thoroughly adaptable to all classes and conditions of humanity. When we speak of religion we are of course referring to the broad principles of Christianity upon which the advocates of this theory agree as it is the only religion which can give a positive civilization to the

world. We do not believe that the introduction of religious instruction even on the basis of the broadest interpretation of Christian teachings would work out in practice. It is very evident such a plan would not be acceptable to the Hebrew, Catholic and a large majority of the Protestants and many other forms of religious life which are represented in our public schools. All these conditions must be borne in mind in advocating this theory. At the same time it is well nigh impossible to interpret religion on the broadest basis to eliminate every iota of denominational and doctrinal viewpoint. The public school is not a religious nor an anti-religious school, but it is a secular institution and we want to see it remain as such. We want to see it give the best instruction possible so that our children become well educated along scientific, literary, aesthetic and institutional lines.

We recognize that there is considerable weight in the proposition which is set forth in citing the German schools as an example where an excellent and practical course of religious instruction obtains. We have every reason to expect this condition of affairs there. The German people are the inheritors of the great Lutheran movement and Luther was a staunch champion and advocate of religious education in the schools. Such splendid opportunities are afforded in Germany for the advancement of religious instruction that we have every reason to expect such instruction to be given which shall be the best. Since the Lutheran faith is the state church of Germany these measures of religious instruction have the support of the Government. In the United States such conditions do not obtain. Nor would we want them to exist. We realize the supreme necessity of having the Church and the dependence of the Government upon the Church, but we would not want some particular denomination to be the state church. American ideals and conceptions of religious and civil liberty and democracy show these principles are foreign to our viewpoint.

We agree with many educators that the Bible should be placed in our public schools to be studied as *literature*,

history, and *morals*. But let it be stated here that the study of the Bible thus is not religious instruction and the Bible to be studied along the three lines suggested must be confined to the basic fundamentals of these subjects. We think the Bible from this viewpoint should find a place in our schools. It is the general verdict of all peoples who know about the Bible that it is the repository of the world's sublimest literature! If the study of the Koran, Hindu writings, Milton, Lamb's Tales, etc., may find a place in our school curriculum, if the teacher so desires, why should the historical study of Joshua, a literary study of the Psalms or a study of the moral precepts of the Pauline epistles be forbidden? We cannot see any sane reason for their omission.

Dr. Seeley in his charmingly written book says: "I believe that our teachers should have larger right of way to emphasize the importance of these virtues, (i. e., honesty, sobriety, etc.), so that with the culture and furnishing of the intellect, there shall come the development of the individual along moral lines, of religious lines, if you please, and yet not in a sectarian way. Our teachers and superintendents, as a rule, are Christian men and women, and there go out indirectly in their lives influences in this direction."⁶

However, we cannot agree with Dr. Seeley in advocating the study of the Bible as a religious book. For the reason previously stated and also by way of the following example. The Hebrew father would have every right to object according to his religious beliefs and traditions for the principles of the Christian religion being taught the child. The Bible is broad and big enough in its wonderful work to teach the highest form of morals without touching upon its religious precepts. Again we say religion cannot be consistently taught in our public schools. However the two great factors which are to teach our children religious truths are the Home and the Church.

6 Foundations of Education—Seeley—p. 248.

THE HOME.

The home is the first and always should remain the most important factor in a child's education. This training should extend from the early years of childhood to manhood. The ancient Hebrews recognized the supreme importance of home instruction and they earnestly tried to bring up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord. When this ideal was earnestly adhered to peace, joy, and prosperity crowned the people of Israel. In this respect the ancient Hebrew people will always be an example for the present and future generations.

The home is the basic unit of society. It is such an important institution that great emphasis needs to be laid upon the instruction of Biblical truths therein. Alas in too many of our homes the Bible is a closed Book and religious instruction is never given at all. No parent can expect the school and the Church to give all the education the child needs. Too many parents seek to shift all of the training of their children upon the Church and the school. This is impossible. These two important educational factors can never give training to a child which is expected to come from the hearth stone. Time and their specialized organization make it impossible.

There should always be the closest co-operation between the home and the school and the Church. The parents should take a hearty interest in the daily school tasks of their children and whatever home work may be required by the school authorities, they should see that their children perform their tasks faithfully and well. By this close co-operation the efficiency of the public schools would be increased.

The home should also co-operate more earnestly with the Church and give it better support and see that the children attend the sessions of the Sunday School regularly and faithfully. Too many parents think it is the duty alone of the pastor and the Bible School teacher to see that their children attend the Church worship and sessions of the Bible School. They are frequently met with the statement on the part of the parent as was a

Bible School teacher who once visited a home to see that one of the daughters attended her Bible School class more regularly when the mother said to the teacher: "It was her duty to see that her daughter attended regularly." We agree that it is the duty of pastors and teachers to see that the children come regularly but it is not their whole nor first duty, for this rests upon the home.

The home, therefore, remains the first important factor in the religious education of the child life.

THE CHURCH.

The importance of the Church to a community is well recognized. No community could exist without it. The Church particularly through the Bible School is the second important factor for religious education. A great responsibility rests upon the Bible School and it is a much needed part of our educational work to-day. For it to do the work of religious education which is in large measure incumbent upon it, it must be efficiently organized and utilize the best methods for it to attain the purpose of its organization.

The Bible School must work in the closest co-operation with the public school because upon it mostly devolves the task of teaching the child religious principles which the public school does not.

The Bible School needs to be thoroughly and systematically organized. Its curriculum needs to be placed on a scientific and analytic basis if efficient instruction is to be given. Its teachings must be adaptable to child life with a knowledge of the capacities and needs of the child. The school, it must be remembered, is not only to teach religion as such *per se* but its curriculum should correlate as closely as possible with the public school teaching. In other words, Biblical history, geography, biography, literature, art and precepts should be carefully taught. As in the public schools, there needs to be careful and systematic grading of the classes, so that the teaching of these studies may be adaptable to the capacities of the children.

The teachers need to be trained and thoroughly prepared to carry on their work. Bible School teaching, like

public school teaching, requires training to be thoroughly done. In order that the work of the Bible School may be advanced, there needs to be closest co-operation between the home and the school.

It is necessary if the school is to be efficient in teaching the children of the household. The spirit of co-operation between the two must be very close in order to secure regular attendance upon the Bible School. This is one of the difficult problems which we face at present. Attendance upon the public school is compulsory. Not so with the Bible School. The attendance there is often irregular on the part of a large number of the children and under present conditions an exceedingly large number of children are not receiving religious instruction. However, we believe this problem can be reduced to a minimum or overcome entirely by close co-operation of Bible School and home. Perhaps a suggestion on this point would be in order which we believe could be worked out along practical lines if the Bible School would employ a trained and paid Secretary for this work, or if a number of churches in the city or town would group together to meet the expense, and it would be his duty to come in contact with each home and get the children to go to the school of their denomination. Appeals to the responsibility of parents will be the only way the children can ever be brought into the Sunday School.

We believe, too, that the study period for the Bible School lesson should cover a period of at least one hour instead of half an hour. The lesson period may be made so interesting and inspiring on the part of a trained teacher that there would be no difficulty experienced on this point. We believe it would be feasible for each child to do a little homework on various exercises which could be reported to the teacher the following Sunday. This work could be of such a nature as not to interfere with the public school work. In any event we see the need and importance of religious education and the work of carrying it on devolves upon the Bible School. This great institution we want to make more efficient in every way possible.

*Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

In the *Methodist Review* (July-Aug.) Professor Irwin R. Beiler of Baker University, Kans., in writing about "The Christian Religion and the Scientific Method" protests against the reduction of Christian experience to a scientific formula. He believes that to attempt to do this would expose it to the following dangers:

1. The formulation of a science of religious experience would tend to make it mechanical. Codification, whether of the moral ideas of Confucius, the moral laws of Moses, or the teaching of Jesus as in mediaeval times, has always resulted in formalism, the destruction of the spirit and the deification of the letter. Formulated prayers have become magical incantations. The Mosaic law and its Rabbinic additions had become God and religion to the Hebrews of Jesus' day. God was a judge who spent part of his time studying the law. Illustrations could be multiplied to show that whenever religious life condenses to the codified it has little or no interest in the individual; that whenever its essence is expressed in its external form, be it code or ceremony, it tends to become lifeless and to lose its power over the human heart. What reason have we to believe that the formulation of a science of the religious experience, valid for all, would be an exception to the history of its kind?

2. That truth tends to become petrified when systematized is true even in science. It is still truer in religion. There is value in keeping it stirred up and not allowing it to crystallize. May not the element of uncertainty about some things in our religious life be a blessing in disguise? Some would have God so physically visible in the world, and immortality so sensuously evident, that neither could be questioned by the most skeptical. Not only is there more interest in the open and unsettled, as evidenced by the effect of dogma upon the layman and

even upon the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, but more room for progress remains when questions about the facts themselves do not permit the interpretations of them to grow cold and solidify. This truth makes easier the revelation to us, sometime in the future, of those things which we were not and perhaps are not able to bear. The petrified forms of living truth, the fluid "Zeitgeist" frozen stiff whether in Palestine at the opening of the Christian era, or in the Italy of mediaeval days, or in the America of the nineteenth century, have gripped the religious as well as the intellectual life like a vise and prevented progress.

3. Finally, there is danger that all not proved will be lightly regarded. It throws the religious life especially open to attack from naturalism, which will demand that all not proved or explained be rejected. Reduce religion to the humanly rational solely, to the categories of science, if you will, and what have you left? Daniel Webster's words reach us at this point, that a religion we could completely understand would not be big enough to hold us. Reduce it to the merely scientific and this danger could not be avoided. Herrmann thinks there is, perhaps, no greater religious danger than that Christian people generally may not come to see that the great facts of religious experience are not a part of the world with which science deals, and so can no more be proved or disproved by its methods than explained by its laws and principles.

"Modern Political Oratory, and its Lessons for the Preacher" is the theme of an article by George Jackson in *The London Quarterly Review*. He writes very sensibly as follows:

The day of the pulpit is no more past than is the day of the platform, provided always that the preacher will bring to his task both honest work and utmost sincerity. He too, can "win votes," if it is the winning of votes, the response of men's souls on which his heart is set. "To the prophets," it has been finely said, "preaching was no mere display, but a sore battle with the hard hearts of their

contemporaries, in which the messenger of the Lord worked with the pity of his weakness upon him, at a supreme cost to himself and consciousness that he must summon to his desperate task every resource of feeling and of art." Such preaching has never failed. It has great allies. It has an ally, albeit often a slumbering one, in every human breast. It has an ally, "living and active" in God Himself. Such preaching cannot fail.

The attempt is sometimes made to disparage the work of the preacher by reminding us of its fleeting and impermanent character. What floods of instruction, exhortation, and appeal are poured forth every week from the pulpits of our land; and what, men ask, comes of it all? Of the countless volumes of sermons that are annually issued from the press, how many survive the years of their birth? Once or twice in a generation a great preacher arises, like John Henry Newman, or Frederick William Robertson, whose sermons take their place in our literature, but the rest vanish and are forgotten like a child's sand-castles before the advancing tide. We can count on the fingers of one hand all the books of sermons that the editor of *Everyman's Library* has thought it worth while to include in his seven hundred volumes of the world's literature. "Vanity of vanities," saith the preacher, "all is vanity"—even the preachings of the preacher himself.

But this quality of impermanence is no singularity of the preacher's work; it attaches to all human speech, to that of the politician no less than to that of the preacher. If sermons make but a poor show in *Everyman's Library*, political oratory fares no better. From Demosthenes downwards, with America thrown in to help, it can muster but seven volumes in all. Gladstone's speeches made a considerable noise in their day, but who reads them now? An enterprising publisher once ventured on an edition of them in ten volumes; I should be surprised to learn that he had ten pence for his pains. If there are any speeches in the English language that are safe against the tooth of time, they are probably those of Edmund Burke. But the significant thing is that discourses

which have been for succeeding generations a very mine of political wisdom only won for their author at the time the nickname of "the dinner bell of the House of Commons." As prose literature the speeches of Burke are imperishable; as speeches, judged in the only way that speeches can be judged, namely by their influence on those who heard them, they were generally failures. Nor is the reason far to seek. They were not real speeches at all, but political treatises which happen to have been spoken. So that Burke is no real exception to that impermanence which belongs to almost all forms of the spoken word.

An address on "Religious Advance in Fifty Years," given at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Dr. Faunce of Brown University, as reported in *The American Journal of Theology* (July), concludes as follows:

All this is heartening and inspiring. But it forces upon us an immensely serious problem. It is the success of the Christian faith which now imperils it. It is the victory of the Church which may mean its absorption. Can the Church compete with the organization itself has created? Can Christianity control the spirits it has evoked? Will the Church remain the center of hope and joy and inspiration to the struggling world? Or will it give way to the innumerable associations it has energized, to the social leaders it has inspired, to the ethical movements it has generated? Shall Christianity be devoured by its own children, or shall it show itself mightier than all its transient offspring? If it is to survive, it must refuse to change its nature. It must hold itself more sacred, more divine than any of the changing channels through which it flows. It must refuse to be dissolved into poetry, into sociology, into civic betterment, or any other partial goods. It must decline to be side-tracked into public playgrounds or cheap lodging-houses. These are its fruit, but never its roots. It must keep the soul on top. It must master the powers it has let loose on

the world. It must rise above all its varying expressions and remain, as it has been in all its most triumphant days, at once the power of God and the wisdom of God.

The Harvard Theological Review (July) has a fine appreciation of Confucianism from the pen of Edward T. Williams. The restoration of this ancient faith by the new President of China as the national religion involves many problems. The author writes:

"In view of the facts recited it seems worth while to consider what there is in Confucianism that gives it such a hold upon the affections of the Chinese people, what relation the religion sustains to their moral standards, what adaptability it shows to the needs of modern life, whether or not there are any elements in it worth preserving. Confucianism profoundly influences the life of every individual in China. As a child the Chinese is taught to bow reverently to the tablet of the sage when he enters and leaves the school room. The sacred scriptures edited by Confucius are the text-books given him to study, and these he learns by heart. The ritual prescribes the ceremonies to be observed when he attains his majority, the worship of Heaven and Earth and his ancestors when he is married, the solemn service of mourning for the dead, the offerings to be made in the hall at the winter solstice and those at the grave in the spring. As a member of the community he joins in the service at the Confucian temple at the new and the full moon and particularly at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. As an official he must worship also at the local altar to the spirits of the land and the harvest, and in the temples to the various patron saints and heroes of the State. Like other religions, Confucianism has its private and public worship; those suited to the individual, or rather the family life, and those intended for the community and the nation."

"The relation of the Confucian religion to the moral standards of the people is a very intimate one. The Confucian classics, which are the sacred books, hold ever before the Chinese student a high ideal of character. Justice, mercy, self-denial, sincerity, moral courage, filial and

fraternal affection—all these virtues are repeatedly emphasized. It aims to strengthen the three bonds of society—that is to say, those between parent and child, husband and wife and between ruler and subject. Thus it seeks to provide peace in the home and order in the State. It insists upon the worship of the spirits, but it teaches that virtuous living is a condition of acceptance with God. “The spirits are not always favorable.” *The Classic of History* says: “they accept only the worship of the sincere.” These scriptures teach that sickness, poverty, drought, pestilence and war are all calamities sent as a punishment for sin. They tell us that ‘the ways of Shang Ti are invariable. Upon the good he bestows blessings, upon the evil-doer he sends down calamities.’

It is natural, therefore, for the Chinese to feel that the moral law finds its sanction in the national religion, and equally naturally to fear an abandonment of the national religion might lead to a deterioration in morals. When the moral standards of society are supposed to find their only sanction in religion, if that religion be abandoned, there is indeed grave danger that the less thoughtful will imagine that moral requirements have lost their authority. In such a society, unless there be stringent legislation and a strong public opinion to secure its enforcement, the individual without religion is apt to fall a prey to vice, social bonds to become relaxed, and government corrupt and efficient.”

“The Effect Upon the Churches of the Social Movement” is presented in an article in *The Harvard Theological Review* (July) by Geo. F. Kenngott, who believes that the Churches are profiting by social agitation. He writes:

“The effect upon the churches of the social message of the gospel had been good as far as it has gone. The Church and its ministry, like some business men wants large and quick returns, and when the expected returns do not materialize immediately, there is a revulsion or new experiment. When the social message of the gospel has been heralded for a century in the dark places of the

earth and the Christian motive has invaded the councils of nations and sects, it will be time enough to condemn the social emphasis if it has not succeeded. Certainly the old individualistic appeal has not produced a Christian society or state. I believe in a new and social revival, different from any revival that has preceded, a revival of civic righteousness. A certain kind of socialist says, 'Let the better world come by economic law.' The Christian socialists like Maurice and Kingsley say, 'Let the better world come by law and grace.' The one force works from without, the other from within. Both should co-operate. The social question is a religious question, and all religious men and influences should co-operate. The universal solvent for the social and economic problems of the day is love and good will. The remedy for the present sad state of affairs must be a radical one. The only remedy for the inordinate lust of wealth, the transformation of men into mere 'hands,' the exploitation of the unskilled and ignorant by the selfish and designing, is first to seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. The worship of God alone can overthrow the worship of gold."

"Better than the dreams of the past, a necessity to interpret the realities of the present, is the vision of the City Beautiful that is to come, when men and women of every race worship God in the beauty of holiness; 'when there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free'; when each man is the equal and complement of every other man which the freest opportunity for self realization and self-expression, and with every possible inducement to do the right; when the boys and girls may play with perfect safety, if not in the streets at least in their playgrounds, and the aged may lean on their staves with the happy children gathered about them, as they say, like St. John in the marketplace, 'Little children, love one another'; when youth will have time to grow in grace and knowledge, and not be ground under the wheels of the modern Juggernaut before they have passed the storm and stress of early adolescence; when the strong men of action, the

'captains of industry' will bear each other's burdens and 'do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God' ; when all employers and employed, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, foreigner and native, male and female, shall be one, working with God and with one another. New men, inspired from on high will make new conditions. The confusion of tongues which pride and selfishness caused on the plains of Shinar is changed into harmony and peace at the Pentecost of love and good will in the Holy City."

The English Quarterlies contain much that bears on the great war. *The Hibbert Journal* (July) prints an article that was written during the Russian-Japanese War by the late Stopford A. Brooke. This article entitled "A Discourse on War," contains the following warning pertinent to the present situation :

Let England, let all the nations of the earth take warning! We are ourselves at the present moment in danger. In spite of all the efforts men of just and good will are making, the richer and more comfortable classes in this country, and their idle society, are becoming too fond of ill-got wealth, too luxurious, too reckless in wasteful expenditure, too idle, too immoral, too thoughtless of the duties of citizenship, too much like slaves of appetite, not to wake in the minds of the poor, the unemployed and the better class of workmen an indignation, wrath and sense of injustice which will not long be silent or inactive, and which, taken up by the scum of the towns, may breed violent riot, plunder and destruction. We are not so far from this as we imagine. Let Parliament look to this! Above all, let a rich and careless society mend its ways and learn its duties!

Of this terrible social and universal war, covetousness is also the root. This is as plain as the sun in the sky. If you want to lessen the pains of this war, to bring about a peace, to establish a juster, freer, nobler social state, purge, I repeat your own soul, set free your life from covetousness of every kind; and then you will be able by speech and action to unite yourself with all those who are striving to redeem society from the curse of this war,

and to establish, however far away, another social state in which war shall be no more. That is, and that is to be, the hope, the faith and the enthusiasm of the future world. Live in, and for, that hope, abide in the faith of it and let every act, thought and emotion of your life catch the fire of its enthusiasm. Then England may grow young again. New art, new literature, new politics, new business will be born, and science will no longer minister to the destruction but to the health and betterment of men.

Gettysburg, Pa.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

For more than six months now it has been impossible to get any kind of religious or theological literature from Germany. Shipment of books and papers seems to be completely shut off by the blockade. It is very difficult therefore to learn much about the trend of thought and of events within Germany.

It may not be amiss, however, to discuss here some of the religious and ethical effects of the great war upon the German people as those effects were indicated in the literature that appeared during the early months of this year. For war is a great test of the religious and moral stamina of peoples just as personal suffering and grief is a test of the faith and the ethical strength of the individual.

Since the war with France in 1870 the German people have always had great confidence in their army. But the great question was concerning the spirit of the nation itself. The efficient organization of the military forces and the bravery of the troops were nowhere called into question. But what about the people themselves, the nation as a whole? Would the rank and file of the German nation in case of war manifest such qualities of character as would insure another splendid victory like that of Sedan, or would they manifest such a lack of will-power and such an incapacity for achievement as would lead to another inglorious surrender like that of Jena in 1806? This was the question before the present war broke out.

A careful examination of the signs of the times in Germany during the two decades or more preceding the outbreak of the great war would have revealed some symptoms of a moral decline on the part of the German people. The great increase in national wealth had the effect of softening and refining the modes of living and thus had produced in certain quarters a sort of hyperaesthesia in

external life. Nothing really worth while had been accomplished either in art or on the stage. The field of literature seemed to be filled with amateurs and imitators. The mental sciences were being neglected while the physical and technical sciences were blossoming forth luxuriantly. Scepticism was rife. A onesided individualism was asserting itself. The masses hung slavishly and uncritically upon the assured "results of science." And finally, there was a ruinous spirit of partisanship and fratricidal controversy in religious affairs and in scientific circles as well as in politics. These are some of the characteristics of the times that a close observer might have remarked and they would have seemed to justify a certain degree of doubt concerning the essential vigor and the genuine powers of endurance on the part of the nation.

But now all such doubts have vanished. The German people has stood the test of war. They have stood the test, not as in 1806 when "for the sake of humanity" strong fortresses surrendered without firing a single shot of cannon, but as in 1870 when the whole nation from the Memel to Lake Constance, as Bismarck had predicted, burst forth like an exploding powder-magazine and furnished a most thrilling spectacle of patriotism, courage, and sacrifice. The gruelling experiences of the present war have once more tried the nerve and the sinew of the German nation. And now it is clear that their powers of achievement have not waned and their capacity for endurance has not vanished. The soft living that an observer with a false perspective might have regarded as a fundamental characteristic of the modern German nation, the aesthetic ideals, the irreligious views and the immoral practices, the winds of socialism and the hot fires of controversy, are seen now to have been only superficial and not of the essence of the modern German soul. They were but a thin veneer and had not touched the real heart of the people.

When war came superficialities fell away and realities stood forth. False ideals and perverse culture were scat-

tered to the winds. Aesthetics waned but ethics waxed. Scepticism and criticism no longer sufficed to meet the needs of the soul. The quality of faith which had been crowded into a corner came forth and entered into its own. An accentuated individualism vanished before the commands of the military chieftains. Lyric poetry was drowned out by the roll of the drum. The egoistic cultivation of "personality" disappeared as the educated and cultured joined the ranks with the raw sons of the peasants. It suddenly became a virtue to subject the will and to renounce individuality. The strong fiber and the stern stuff of the deep German soul asserted itself in its pristine tenacity and that too in a remarkably short lapse of time. All those unlovely qualities of personal and national character that had begun to manifest themselves during the last few decades are seen now to have remained upon the surface and not to have reached the real heart of the people.

Perhaps the future historian, who will be able to see things in their proper perspective and thus judge the years that preceded the outbreak of this war, will come to the conclusion that this awful conflagration arrived just at the right time to save Germany from a serious moral decline. A decade later might have been too late. False religions and soft morals might have eaten into the very vitals of the body politic. The philosophy of history will doubtless see a divine providence in the terrible baptism of blood through which the German people is now passing. But there can be no doubt that the nation is standing the test and is manifesting qualities of sacrifice and devotion almost inconceivable.

In his organ, *Die Reformation*, Professor Seeberg writes: "During the opening days of the war I visited a number of places in the German fatherland. The total impression that I received from my experiences in those days is unforgettable. Among old and young and in all classes of the people there was a deep seriousness and a grim determination that was most impressive. There were tears but there was no complaining. And how edifying it was to listen to the conversations of the youth!

Everywhere it was the same tone: Our cause is just and God will help us; and again, The individual is nothing, the country is everything. It was not merely the educated classes who thus expressed themselves, but the same note rang out in the field and in the factory, in the store and on the street. The youth of the land hold the future in their hands and it was both a refreshing consolation and a glorious prophecy to witness the unanimity, imperishable and invincible, that prevailed among the younger generation in those serious days of testing.

“Older persons can easily fall into the error of complaining about the rising generation. But anyone who associated with the youth of our country during the opening days of the war must have felt his heart grow warm with gratitude and joy. Those were glorious days! Depths of soul were laid bare. Precious stones were quarried from the mines of emotion while unlovely pebbles disappeared from view. After all, there was a great deal of affectation in all this cringing attitude towards England and this fawning before the superhuman. But the style of yesterday has disappeared today, as a pimple disappears over night. The veil has fallen and we behold real men today in these youths who in clear and courageous words speak of the great tasks that lie just before them. There is no grandiloquence, no boasting. Sincerity prevails. German essence and Christian sentiments have once more made themselves supreme. Simple courage and deep piety are the order of the day, just as they were in the greatest periods of our history. The bloody work of war has led men back to the art of praying which many had forgotten in the quiet pursuits of peace.”

Many thoughtful Germans have come to look upon this war as a divine dispensation to renew the youth of the nation. With all the terrible loss of life and the lurid destruction of property which the war has entailed, it nevertheless seems to have preserved the nation against the greater evils that inhere in the insidious influence of false ideals. The national decline which threatened the German people during the soft years of peace would have been far more direful both for individuals and for the

nation than any physical losses that have come during these iron years of war.

It is the world of ideas that in the long run controls the life of the nation and determines its fate. But the revolution which this great war has brought about through its readjustment of political power and through its changes in territorial bounds is very insignificant as compared with the revolution it has brought about in the world of ideas. Lines of thought which seemed to permeate the culture of the nation have suddenly lost their force. Views which had long since been set aside as obsolete and naive and therefore unworthy of "cultured personalities," have suddenly come to life and entered into their pristine vigor. For example, Doctor Kadner in his 1915 Yearbook for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bavaria, presents a very readable article on "The Overthrow of Individualism." The same thought comes also from various other sources. Now the overthrow of that one-sided individualism which was beginning to characterize modern German thought before the outbreak of the war, is a fact whose consequences can scarcely be reckoned. It will have a deep influence on the thought-life of the future. It will make itself felt especially in the affairs of the Church and probably also in the theological sciences. The other sciences also, even the most remote and abstract sciences, have received new impulses and new objectives from the ethical revolution of the past two years.

The *Kölnische Zeitung* had an article some time ago on "War as a Teacher" in which it said: "All of us have unlearned our old lessons and have learned new ones. How thoroughly we have learned our new lessons need not be emphasized here. Deep in our hearts lives the holy consciousness that we belong together. We feel this so deeply that we cannot express it in words. Movement and vigor has come into our life again. Our millions of men have lived for months in constant readiness to die. They have been willing to dispense with all the refinements of civilization and even with the comforts of life. They have not hesitated to offer their goods and their

lives. And in all this they have been inspired by a common purpose and sustained by a common motive, a high sense of duty and devotion and an incomparable spirit of sacrifice. The effect of this upon the living can never be lost. What had once seemed of value, glitter and luxury and comfort, lost its attractiveness and became a matter of complete indifference. A whole people looked into the face of dire extremity, the danger of losing its country and forfeiting its independence as a nation, and determined to avert that calamity at any cost and under any sacrifice whatsoever. Immediately the supreme aim of the whole people and the impelling ideal of the individual underwent a profound change. Henceforth men were judged as men and as citizens according to the degree of their willingness to offer themselves up in behalf of the single purpose of the nation. This it is that indicates the greatness of the times and this is the one fundamental thought that has become the controlling factor in the life of the present day."

This remarkable change in ethical values was accompanied by a similar change in religious values. In the midst of war's confusion the Bible has been restored to its former dignity and has manifested its imperishable power. The Old Testament had seemed to the cultured mind of the modern world to have become thoroughly obsolete and was regarded merely as an interesting literary monument of primitive times. But now it has suddenly become new again and indeed quite modern. It seems as if the Psalms had been written for these very times. The ancient prophets appear again as keen observers of the times with expert knowledge of the human heart. The simple Gospel has been resurrected with all its treasures of strength and comfort. And the rich storehouse of thought in the apostolic letters is welcomed again by willing ears and longing hearts.

This does not mean that the German people has suddenly taken the old attitude towards God's Word which it held in Luther's day. That would be asserting far too much. It simply means that the old Bible has come again into a position of dignity and majesty commanding the

respect and reverence of men, reaching their hearts, filling them with courage, comforting them in pain and grief, and lifting them out of the depths. This is only a beginning and the fruit of all this is yet to grow.

It is as yet much too early to speak of a regeneration of the whole German nation. This entire revolution in the ethical sphere and this entire change of attitude on religious questions must be viewed in the light of the ancient saying of the philosopher Celsus, "Piety proceeds first of all from a feeling of awe." But from awe and reverence a bridge may easily be built to the genuine fear of God and filial piety towards Him. To build that bridge is the prime task before the Church of Germany today. The religious tide will ebb. It is to be hoped that the German Church will not be so unprepared and so helpless before her opportunities at the close of this war as she was at the close of the war of 1870. War in itself does not beget a new religious life: war only prepares the way for it. The religious resuscitation of the German people will not be a gift of the war; it will only be a possibility presented by the war, a problem to be solved during and after the war. And many and multiform are the suggestions that are now being made in various quarters for the religious restoration which is written so clearly on the docket of the German people.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

A. J. HOLMAN CO. PHILADELPHIA.

Works of Martin Luther with Introduction and Notes.

Vol I. Cloth. Gilt Top. Pp. 412. Crown 8vo.

Price per Vol. \$2.00 net. Vol. I and II are now on sale.

The present volumes are the first of a series of ten, which are made up of translations from the original Latin and German works of Luther. The Introduction informs us that the aim of the series is to furnish within the limits proposed "a selection of such treatises as are either of permanent value, or supply the best means for obtaining a true view of his many-sided literary influence." The late Dr. Spaeth was the Chairman of the Committee that organized the work. He has been ably succeeded by Dr. H. E. Jacobs. The other members of the Committee are Drs. Schmauk, Reed, Jacobs, Jr., Steimle, Steinhaueser, and Revs. W. A. Lambert and J. J. Schindel. Upon the five last named the burden of preparing the translations and notes has rested. The translations of each treatise is preceded by a learned historical introduction giving the proper setting of the treatise. About fifty pages are devoted to these introductions in the first volume. Both the introductions and the treatises are enriched by copious foot-notes, which shed much light on the text.

The contents of the series embrace both some of the best known and some of the least known of Luther's writings. Of the fifteen treatises contained in the first two volumes ten have never been translated into English before. Moreover, these translations are not garbled or expurgated. They say in English what Luther said in German and Latin. The first volume presents treatises on Indulgences, Baptism, Confession, Consolation, Good Works, the New Testament, and the Papacy. The second volume contains the three celebrated productions: An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and A Treatise on Christian Liberty. Beside these there are discussions on the Blessed Sacrament, the Ban, the first three parts of the Catechism, the Eight Wittenberg Sermons, and the Doctrines of Men.

Each volume has a complete index. The translations are idiomatic and clear, and while fairly literal they avoid Germanism.

These volumes make the immortal Luther stand out just as he was—human and fallible, yet courageous, far-seeing and generally correct in his judgments, the man of the centuries!

These volumes merit a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

DOUBLEDAY, PAGE AND CO. GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

Sunday, The World's Rest Day. An illustrated story of the Fourteenth International Lord's Day Congress, held in Oakland, Cal., edited by a committee appointed by the Congress. Published for the N. Y. Sabbath Committee. Cloth. PPp. xiv. 622. Price \$1.50.

This volume contains the papers and addresses given at the Fourteenth International Lord's Day Congress at Oakland, California, 1915. These papers and addresses are the fruits of earnest thought, diligent research and varied experience. The authors are among the most eminent men and women of America and Europe. The various types of religious faith are represented—Hebrew, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and the leading denominations of the Protestant Church. The writers are of twenty-five different occupations and spheres of life—actors, agriculturists, butchers, clergymen, economists, editors, educators, financiers, florists, journalists, laborers, lawyers, manufacturers, miners, missionaries, physicians, scientists, socialists, soldiers, statesmen, trademen, traffic managers, railroad superintendents, ranchmen and theologians.

This is a very useful book, the minister will find in it many facts and arguments for interesting sermons on the vital question of a proper observance of the Lord's Day. The range of the discussions is wide, embracing the religious, social, legal and industrial aspects of the Sunday question. It seems at first somewhat strange that a Jew should be included among the contributors; and yet his point of view must be considered. He makes an earnest plea that the Jewish Sabbath be accorded the same rights in a free land as the Christian's Sunday.

The foes of Sunday Rest are considered by the writers of three papers to be the saloon, the excursion, and the Sunday newspaper. The "Civil Sabbath" is ably dis-

cussed by Dr. Josiah Strong. He argues from purely personal and patriotic grounds that laws restricting labor and pleasure on Sunday are not merely justifiable but actually necessary. He holds that Sunday rest is a physical necessity, and that it promotes financial prosperity! The State has an inherent right to prohibit certain amusements on Sunday if they be found injurious to the morals of the people. It is a fact that popular liberty is safeguarded by the religious observance of the Lord's Day.

Dr. G. U. Wenner of the Lutheran Church contributes a useful paper on "Holiday or Holy Day?" It contains a historical resume of the Sabbath and a plea for the maintenance of this divine institution on the part of Church and State.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

ASSOCIATION PRESS. NEW YORK.

Basic Ideas in Religion or Apologetic Theism. By Richard Wilde Micou, D.D., late Professor of Theology and Apologetics at the Theological Seminary in Virginia, and formerly at the Philadelphia Divinity School. Edited by Paul Micou, B.D., Secretary for Theological Seminaries of the International Committee Y. M. C. A. Cloth. Pp.xxii. 496. Price \$2.50.

Dr. Micou died of heart failure at the age of sixty-four at the zenith of his fine career as a theologian, and just as he was about to commit to permanent form the results of his long and accurate studies. He was fortunate, however, in having a son and pupil who found it a congenial task to gather from various sources the notes made by his father, and to combine them in the volume before us. The work of both is well done. The reader is grateful to the editor that matter of such superlative value in such excellent grouping has been preserved. One is drawn to Dr. Micou by his evident natural ability, erudition, discrimination, fairness and, above all, living faith. He analyzes all problems suggested by philosophy, science and history concerning the doctrines of God and Man, and finds no reason that would cause him to abandon the simple faith of the Christian. He holds that while it may be difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate in a purely logical way the existence of the Christian God, the devout student is confirmed in his intuitive convictions and Bib-

lical faith by the contemplation of the facts and the arguments furnished by observation and deduction.

The method of treatment is at once clear and profound, enriched by the gleanings of wide reading, especially in philosophy. The thetical affirmations are sustained by clear reasoning and the untenableness of the anti-thetical arguments is exposed.

The Idea of God is studied along four lines—Observation furnishing “The Witness of History,” Reasoning, “The Witness of the Intellect,” Aesthetics, “The Witness of the Beautiful and the Sublime,” and Intuition, “The Witness of the Spirit.” The first point deals with the theories of the origin of religion. The second sets forth the old philosophical arguments, the Cosmological, and the Teleological, and also the Anthropological argument. This last argument presents matters pertaining to human personality, freedom and conscience. The third general argument is built upon the presence of the beautiful in nature, which must indicate a beauty loving Personality back of it. The fourth—the argument from Intuition—emphasizes the universal, ineradicable conviction that there is a God. There is an instinctive faith in the human soul that reaches out after God. No contrary reasoning can eliminate it. This intuition is the basis of the Ontological argument, which comes down from the ancient philosophers but which received its logical phrasing from Anslem. A note in the Appendix is quite illuminating concerning the attitude of Anselm, who has been misunderstood and even derided. “Anselm’s postulate is that God exists so truly that He cannot be thought not to exist. He quoted the verse in the Psalms, ‘The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God’ to show that only a fool could make such a statement, for either he does not know the real meaning of the word, ‘God, in which case he is foolish to say anything at all, or he does know its meaning, and in that case he is logically a fool, for he affirms a contradiction in terms, since ‘God’ means the universal ground of being, and the fool’s remark would, therefore, be ‘Existence does not exist.’” Confronted with the objection that things could be imagined to be more beautiful than they actually are and that imagination cannot impart beauty or existence, his reply was that his argument applied to only one idea, which we call God. Anslem was right. He believed that a universal and necessary intuition must have its objective counterpart. His appeal was to those who had faith and his argument was intended to be a confirmation of it. And this it certainly is. The Cosmological

argument is the application of the axiom that every effect must have a cause anterior and exterior to itself. This simple intuitive conviction is as old as the race, and appeals with force to the great mass of mankind. Back of the universe with its marvelous adaptations must stand an absolute Creator.

In connection with the Teleological argument, Dr. Micou discusses at some length and with much thoroughness the question of Evolution, which he defines as "a revelation of God's method of creation in the organic world by continuous and progressive modifications from within, instead of by discontinuous and instantaneous flats from without, its analogy being organic growth, not mechanical action. The whole process reveals an immanent teleology guiding and determining the end from the beginning."

While gratefully receiving the facts discovered by Darwin he shows the utter fallacy of much of his reasoning, especially the unwarranted introduction of chance as a principal factor in the development of the universe. Darwin, he says, "is guilty of what might be termed a new logical fallacy, the fallacy of the imperceptible. He seems to think that if a thing grows slowly by minute gradations it needs no explanation, the process is its own cause. But no modification, however gradual, can begin a new line of growth, nor create even in germ that into which it is to develop. The smallest germ of an eye, a tiny nerve surface sensitive to light, is a new thing in nature when it first appears, and the environment could never produce it. It is from the first a potential eye, and all after developments simply carry on to perfect form the possibilities latent in that sensitive film."

The author discards the mechanical theory of evolution. He holds that back of the laws of nature is the Divine Energy, "guiding and overruling the whole process of continuous creation by definite modifications through immanent directive and formative forces which work in harmony with the environment and gradually embody the type of species in final form."

The Second Part of the volume contains a presentation of "The Spiritual Idea of Man," showing him to possess an immortal soul. History testifies to a universal belief in man's immortality and conscience affirms it. Life in its earthly aspects is felt to be incomplete, demanding an endless future for its satisfaction. There can be no communion with God unless man knows himself to be immortal. In illustration of this truth the author devotes

a chapter to quotations from the poets—Shakespeare, Milton, Cowper, Shelley, Wordsworth, Arnold, Tennyson, Browning and others.

In the whole discussion Dr. Micou is especially strong in his defense of the truth against the perversions of false philosophy.

We heartily commend the volume to the thoughtful.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings with the assistance of Drs. John A. Selbie and Louis H. Gray. Volume viii. Life and Death—Mulla. Cloth. 8 x 11. Pp. xx. 910. Price \$7.00 per volume.

The evident purpose of this great *Encyclopaedia* to present facts in an undogmatic way is realized in the volume before us. The reader may draw his own conclusions. The first article treats of Life and Death in the comprehensive manner which characterizes this work, covering forty-six large pages. The biological aspects of the subject are ably presented by Prof. J. A. Thompson of Aberdeen University. He acknowledges that life in its essence is not known to the biologist, but he is sure that neither Bio-chemistry nor Bio-physics can explain it. The origin and nature of life find an adequate explanation in the Bible alone. The new world-view and the extraordinary discoveries of science do but establish the truth that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

The article on Lourdes, written by a Catholic is a defence of what the Protestant claims to be gross imposture, made somewhat plausible by the alleged experiences of neurotic persons. Most marvelous cures of every nature are reported to have taken place at Lourdes through the intervention of the Holy Virgin. The author with apparent frankness affirms that these cures are utterly inexplicable from the standpoint of medicine or human therapeutics. He denies that they have any affinity with the cures of Christian Science and many other faith-healing organizations. He asserts that the fullest medical investigation is welcomed.

Dr. H. E. Jacobs has furnished the articles on Luther and Lutheranism, giving the gist of the Reformer's life and of the principles of the movement which bears his name. While very brief, these articles are discriminating and comprehensive.

The ancient theological discussions are treated with fairness under such headings as Macedonianism, Monarchianism, and Monotheism. Fifty pages are devoted to Missions,—Buddhist, Christian, Mohammedan and Zoroastrian. Articles on the Messiah, Methodism, the Moravians, Modernism, and Monasticism are full of interest. A Miracle is defined by Dr. MacCulloch “as an occasional evidence of direct divine power in an action striking and unusual, yet by its beneficence pointing to the goodness of God.” Miracles are presented as reasonable and necessary in the divine government.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

MARSHALL JONES CO. BOSTON.

The Mythology of All Races in Thirteen Volumes, Louis Herbert Gray, A.M., Ph.D., Editor. George Foot Moore, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor.

Greek and Roman. By William Sherwood Fox, A.M., Ph.D., Asst. Professor of Classics in Princeton University. Volume I. Size 6½ x 9½ inches. Pp. lxii. 354. Cloth. Illustrated.

North America. By Hartley Burr Alexander, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy in the University of Nebraska. Volume X. Pp. xxiv. 325. Cloth. Illustrated.

The two superb volumes before us are the first of a monumental work to be completed in thirteen volumes. The thoroughness which characterizes the enterprise of publishing a universal mythology is indicated not only by the names of the learned contributors but also by the fact that five years of contract work have been expended on it and seventy-five thousand dollars invested. Various illustrations, including many colored plates, adorn the volumes. The paper and press work are very fine. The work of the respective authors is done with much care.

No such comprehensive work as this has ever before been attempted. It, therefore, occupies a unique place among books. While most thorough and learned the *Mythology of All Races* appeals to any intelligent reader. It is not intended for specialists particularly, but for all who are interested in mankind.

Mythology makes a large contribution to every department of life. The History of Religion cannot be written without a knowledge of it. Science appears in it as understood by primitive people. Their daily life—personal,

domestic, social and political is reflected in it. The symbolism, which appears in its stories and carvings, gives an insight into the profound ideas which were and are cherished by many races. The wisdom of the ancient philosophers, who knew how to interpret nature and the human heart, gleams in the suggestive myths and tales of gods and men.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

SHERMAN, FRENCH AND CO. BOSTON.

Religious Rheumatism. By J. B. Baker. 8 x 5½ inches. Cloth. Pages 220. Price \$1.35.

This volume takes its title from the first chapter, which is much the longest in the book, covering twenty-five pages. All the other chapters are quite brief, not more than eight or ten pages, and are prefaced with texts. They have evidently been used as sermons, at least in substance.

There are sixteen chapters in all, with such topics as "Our Besieging Enemies," "The Icy Hand of God," "A Sprig of Evergreen," "How He Sends Us," "Little Samuel's Coat," "The Hopeless Quest," "The Stick and the Axe," "Finishing the Unfinished," &c.

The very titles of these papers suggest what may be expected in them, and the reader is not disappointed. Sometimes titles are very misleading. Before the days of pure food laws, the label on a package, or can, or bottle, furnished but little guaranty as to its contents. Goods that were advertised as "absolutely pure" were not always found to be so by the buyer. This is sometimes the case even now in spite of all the pure food laws both State and National. It is often so with sermons and addresses, and even with books. It is not always safe to believe everything that the publishers say about the books they offer for sale, and many a congregation has gone to hear a sermon on a bright and attractive theme announced in the papers or on a bulletin board only to listen to a dry, dull discourse droned out without life or interest, a trial to the mind and a weariness to the flesh.

It is not so with the chapters in this book. They are all as original, and fresh, and interesting as the titles themselves. They fairly bubble over with life and inspiration. Sometimes the exegesis may be somewhat strained, sometimes there is a tendency to allegorizing that reminds one of Origen and his school, the rules of Homiletics may be ignored or cast to the winds, there may

be an occasional slip in the rhetoric, but these faults are easily forgiven when the reader is kept wide awake and his interest is caught and held by every sentence, every illustration, every figure of speech, every striking turn of the thought, and he feels all the while that he is being fed on the bread of life, and given to drink of the water of life.

Mr. Baker is always fresh, always original, always interesting. He has the happy faculty of expressing his thought in a bright and telling way. He is always "just a little different," to use a current advertising phrase. Those who have heard him know that this is characteristic of his sermons and addresses. Those who hear him may not always agree with him but they will not go to sleep. The remarkable thing is that these qualities of compelling interest carry over so well into the printed page, and are just as marked a feature in reading after him as in hearing him speak.

All through this volume there is a great wealth of illustrations, historical, classical, mythological, scientific, biographical, narrative, personal and imaginative. Metaphors and similes sparkle everywhere like the dew drops on the grass in the morning sun. Mr. Baker seems to think in pictures, and always to have at hand just the right figure of speech with which to flash the picture from his own mind to the minds of his readers or hearers. This makes live preaching and live writing, and is well worthy of being studied by other preachers and writers, especially those who are just beginning their work.

An extract or two, we are sure, will be appreciated. Take this from the chapter on "A Sprig of Evergreen" based on Col. 1:5, "The hope which is laid up for you in heaven:" "One of the saddest moments for an American tourist going to Europe alone is the moment the ship glides into the port on the other side and receives the salutations of the eager, anxious faces and hands awaiting there. The sadness comes not from the sight of land, for all the tourists are glad for that, nor at the sight of the happy reunions, but from the thought that in all that multitude of waving hands and kerchiefs there is none for him. He is sailing from the charted sea of water into an unknown sea of laughing faces that care as little for him as the foaming billows for the keel.

"But the sadness incident to landing on the other side of the Atlantic will not be felt when he lands on the tropical shore of heaven. When the ship that carries us up from this little world of ours glides into the placid harbor of heaven, there'll be some waiting for us there. I

sometimes think the splendor of our western sky is but the mingled radiance of our loved ones' faces looking eastward. The sun, it seems to me, could not throw such glory there."

We take another selection from the chapter on "Why We Love the Church." "Those who have suffered that we might worship would make the grandest procession that this earth ever witnessed. It would stretch around the world, traverse every country on the globe, go through caves and catacombs, enliven the forests and dazzle the cities. The solid earth alone could not contain it. The Atlantic would have to help, for the heartaches of the Mayflower and the Welcome and the Santa Maria are among the most precious records of heaven; the Pacific would have to help, for it alone could repeat the sufferings of the hundreds who have gone to its many isles; the South Seas would have to give space for Gardner and Calvert and Paton and the thousands of others who struggled and prayed with them; the procession would wind around Cape Horn, it would zigzag its way through the icebergs of Alaska, it would necklace the Alps, it would move through Africa from Cairo to the Cape; but with all its magnitude and with all its splendor it would be like a cathedral without a dome until the Hero of Palm Sunday rode at its head. His sufferings and His death inspired all others and in the all-inclusive capacity of His deity exceeded them in intensity and extent. He above all paid the price not only of our redemption but of our Church. Therefore we love it. It cost all that heaven had. Its price is above the price of rubies, hence it is more to be desired than silver and gold."

The publishers have done their part well in issuing this volume. It is printed in clear type, on a fine quality of paper, and with wide margins that make it a pleasure to the eye of the reader. It is also well bound. We have observed some carelessness in proof reading, as "Sara Maria" for "Santa Maria," the name of Columbus' flag ship, and Patton for Paton the missionary to the New Hebrides, &c. Fortunately there are not many as glaring as these.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections, Made Ready for Pulpit Work. By R. C. H. Lenski. Second Edition carefully Revised, Two Volumes bound in one. 8vo. Half Morocco binding. Pages IX + 1149. Price \$3.50 net.

It is about five years since Professor Lenski issued the first edition of this valuable work. The fact that a second edition has been made necessary in so short a time, gives evidence both of the growing popularity of the Eisenach Gospel and Epistle Selections among Lutheran pastors, and also of the high appreciation of Professor Lenski's expositions. A similar volume on the Eisenach Epistle Selections has been issued by Professor Lenski in the meantime, which has also had a ready sale.

There has long been more or less dissatisfaction with the old Gospel and Epistle Pericopes because of their fragmentary character and their lack of consecutiveness. As is well known, this grows out of the fact that originally there were two additional pericopes for each week for use on Wednesdays and Fridays. When these were included, there was of course a very much fuller and correspondingly more complete presentation both of the life and sayings of our Lord as found in the Gospels, and also of the teachings of the apostles as they are recorded in the Acts and Epistles. The connection between the successive lessons was then also much closer, and much more evident. But the dropping out of the two weekday lessons, and the retention only of the lessons for Sundays, has necessarily broken this connection and gives the impression of fragmentariness for the series as a whole.

The avoidance of this, and a better order of succession and a closer connection, are among the advantages of the Eisebach Selections, which are among the best, and seem to be the most widely used, of the more recent series that have been arranged from time to time. It does seem as though the time ought to be near when Lutherans could get together in some general council, or conference, and agree on a new system of pericopes which would be more satisfactory than the old historic one, and which would be generally recognized and used.

One of the striking and very commendable features of Professor Lenski's work, as presented in these volumes is the prefacing of the comments on each cycle of texts with a chapter on the Cycle itself, in which he sets forth the central thought, or theme, of that Cycle and then points out clearly the relation of each successive lesson in the

Cycle to this central theme. In this way the logical connection of the texts in each Cycle, and also the logical progress of thought in the whole series, is beautifully exhibited. This cannot fail to be a great help both in preaching on the series and also in the use of them for private reading and meditation.

Instead of the customary division of the first, or festival, half of the Church Year into the Christmas, the Easter and the Pentecost Cycles, Professor Lenski prefers to recognize five cycles; Christmas, Epiphany, Lenten, Easter, and Pentecost. The reasons which he gives for this seem to be entirely satisfactory. The central theme of all these Cycles taken together is stated as "The Great Deeds of God for Our Salvation," and then the central theme of each of the five Cycles given falls in under this, and there is a beautiful and logical progress of development from the birth of Jesus at Christmas to His ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

The Trinity Cycle covers the last half of the Church Year, and includes the Sundays from the Sunday after Trinity to the Sunday preceding Advent. The central theme of this Cycle is "The Great Kingdom of God on Earth," but it includes five sub-Cycles each with its own appropriate central thought growing out of the general theme: viz., (1) "The Sinner and the Kingdom." (2) "The Life in the Kingdom." (3) "The Characteristics of the Kingdom." (4) "The Requirements of the Kingdom." (5) "The Consummation of the Kingdom."

But the chief value of these volumes is found in the work which Professor Lenski has done in the exposition of these lessons. The sub-title, "Made Ready for Pulpit Work," might prove misleading to some. It might suggest a series of sermons all ready for use. But this is not what we find. If it were, it might prove to be a very doubtful good to many pastors. What we do find is a series of exegetical and expository notes, quite full and very suggestive, and marked by ample scholarship and a deeply evangelical spirit. From ten to twenty pages are devoted to these notes on each lesson. These are usually followed by a page or two of "Homiletical Hints." These consist of suggestive seed-thoughts, illustrative matter, pertinent quotations, etc. Following these is a series of sermon outlines, some of them original with the author, some of them gathered from others. Of these the author says, they are "meant to be suggestive and stimulating, and not for sluggards to appropriate mechanically."

This last sentence of the author's might well be applied to the entire volume. No doubt a "sluggard" could me-

chanically appropriate a good deal of the rich material here furnished, and unfortunately there are such sluggards in the ministry of all the churches. But it is plainly manifest all through that such was not the author's intention. He has simply sought to furnish the raw material which the earnest and faithful pastor can use in that careful, and thoughtful, and prayerful preparation which should always be made for the preaching of the Gospel. Used as thus intended the volume must prove most helpful.

Before closing we must add a word of praise for the publishers. We have never seen a finer specimen of the art of book-making. The paper, the type, the proof reading, and the binding, are all of the highest class and all that could possibly be expected in a book of this size and price. Indeed it is hard to see how such a book can be sold for the price named in view of the increased cost of materials and of labor. It is a credit not only to the Lutheran Book Concern of Columbus but also to the entire Lutheran Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

BOOKLETS.

Some Counterfeit Religions. An Investigation of the Falsehoods and Reversions taught by the Sects and Isms. By F. C. Longaker, Ph.D., Professor in Lenoir College, Hickory, N. C. Published by the Lutheran Board of Publication, Columbia, S. C. Paper. Pp. 38.

The subjects treated are Spiritism, Russellism, Eddyism, Mormonism, and Socialism. The booklet is a convenient, brief and fair summary of these strange forms of belief among us. It ought to have a wide circulation.

Historical Lutheranism. By Mrs. Harriet Earhart Monroe. Tenth revised edition. Paper. Pp. 28. Price 5 cents a copy, 40 cents a dozen or \$3.00 a hundred. Published by The Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

A new edition of Mrs. Monroe's little catechism in one-hundred questions and answers is timely on the eve of the 400th Anniversary of the Reformation. In brief compass the booklet covers all important phases of the Lutheran Church. Every Lutheran in the land should have a copy, and some additional copies to give away.

A Fourfold Test of Mormonism. Failure of Pro Mormon Apology to Impair the Test. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. Paper. Pp. 40. Price 10 cents a copy. Published by The Abingdon Press, N. Y.

This pamphlet is a supplement to Dr. Sheldon's recent book which bears the same title and should be secured by the owners of the book. The booklet is an answer to the attempt of Robt. C. Webb to refute Dr. Sheldon's treatise. All decent people who know anything of Mormonism know that it is a fraud, and no effort of men like Webb can make them think otherwise. Dr. Sheldon, in his usual calm judicial manner, vindicates his former treatise.

Christ's Humiliation. By Rev. D. Simon, A.M., Dillsboro, Indiana. Paper. Pp. 11. Price 5 cents per copy, 50 cents per dozen, and \$3.00 per hundred. To be had from the author. Published by the Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

This is a devout thetical treatment of the person and work of Christ in His state of humiliation.

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLVI—NO. I.

JANUARY, 1916.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1916

CONTENTS

I. The Old Landmarks	1
By Rev. Ezra K. Bell, D.D.	
II. The Changeless Faith and Changing Conditions.....	10
By Professor Henry E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., S.T.D.	
III. The Rev. Michael Wolfe Hamma, D.D., LL.D.....	34
By Professor David H. Bauslin, D.D.	
IV. Dedication of Hamma Divinity Hall.....	41
By Professor David H. Bauslin, D.D.	
V. Full Assurance of Faith.	63
By Professor Andrew G. Voigt, D.D., LL.D.	
VI. Theological Education in Wittenberg College.....	73
By Rev. Professor B. F. Prince, Ph.D.	
VII. Theological Education in the Lutheran Church Prior to the Founding of Wittenberg College and Seminary in 1845.	82
By Rev. Frederick G. Gotwald, D.D.	
VIII. The Seat of Authority in Religion.....	101
By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
IX. Current Theological Thought.	118
I. In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
II. In German. By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	

X. Review of Recent Literature.....135

John Wesley's Place in History—The Universe as Pictured in Milton's Paradise Lost—Studies in Recent Adventism—The Redemption of the South End—Sermons on the Eisenach Gospels—Sermons on the Catechism Vol. I, the Ten Commandments—The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper—The Reformation and its Effects—The Life and Works of Rev. Charles S. Albert, D.D.—Paul and His Epistles—Religious Education and the Healing of the Church—Trends of Thought and Christian Truth—Pneumatology or the Doctrine of the Work of the Holy Spirit—My Church—The Five-fold Pathway—The Efficient Congregation—The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book—The Methodist Year Book.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUIZ, D. D.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

BASED ON ORIGINAL SOURCES

Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by Preserved Smith, Ph. D.

What a wonderful privilege it is to read the private letters of Martin Luther and the active men of Reformation days. These faithful reflections of their innermost lives show their secret feelings, loves, hates, hopes, suspicions, confidences and comments. There is hardly a better way to obtain a clear insight into the causes and effects of the Reformation—it is history at first-hand.

It is also intensely human and with biographical notes and other necessary annotations, sheds much light on this period of Luther's early spiritual struggle, 1507-1521, the time covered by Volume I. Two more volumes are in preparation.

What Non-Lutherans Have Said About It

"It was a happy thought that suggested the publishing of these letters and the great usefulness of the book is evident and will be appreciated by all those who wish to find the inner sources of the Reformation."—Boston Transcript.

"Such books as this should be in the library of every minister and layman interested in the Reformation period."—Reformed Messenger.

"We doubt if there is another American scholar so well fitted to perform the task as Dr. Smith."—The Advance.

"A treasure-house of the sixteenth century originals more than usually accessible and of great value."—English Historical Review, London.

"This is a valuable source-book of the history of the great revolutionary movement of which Luther was the protagonist."—The Outlook.

Isn't it just the book your library needs—just the information and inspiration you need?

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

P. S. 2287

